

भारत राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 52]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, दिसम्बर 26, 1970/वी० 5, 1892

No. 52]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1970/PAUSA 5, 1892

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उपखण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ क्षेत्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर)

केन्द्रीय प्राधिकरणों द्वारा जारी किये गए विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं।

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories)

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1970

S.O. 4002.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 21 and sub-section (1) of section 22 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951) and in super-session of its notification No. 434/MT/68, dated the 3rd May, 1968, the Election Commission hereby appoints, in respect of each of the Parliamentary Constituencies in the State of Maharashtra, specified in column I of the Table below:—

- the officer specified in the corresponding entry in column 2 of the said Table to be the Returning Officer; and
- the officers specified in the corresponding entries in column 3 of the said Table to be the Assistant Returning Officers.

TABLE

Serial number and name	Returning Officer	Assistant Returning Officer
	(2)	(3)
1. Rajawade	Collector of Ratnagiri.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sawantwadi Division, Sawantwadi. 2. Special Deputy Collector Tenancy Appeals at Sawantwadi. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Ratnagiri Division, Ratnagiri. 4. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Ratnagiri.
2. Ratnagiri	Collector of Ratnagiri.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Ratnagiri. 2. Special Deputy Collector Tenancy Appeals at Chiplun. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Chiplun Division, Chiplun. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Dapoli Division, Dapoli.
3. Kolaba	Collector of Kolaba.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Mahad Division, Mahad. 2. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Kolaba, Alibag. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Alibag Division, Alibag. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Panvel Division, Panvel.
4. Bombay South	Collector of Bombay and Bombay Suburban District.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Special Land Acquisition Officer No. 2, Bombay. 2. Assistant Commissioner (Revenue), Bombay Division, Bombay. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer No. 6, Bombay. 4. Special Land Acquisition Officer No. 4, Bombay.
5. Bombay Central South	Collector of Bombay and Bombay Suburban District.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer (Sale Tax), Bombay and Bombay Suburban District. 2. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Bombay Suburban District. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer No. 4, Bombay. 4. Assistant/Deputy Collector and Resident Assistant/Deputy Collector, Bombay Suburban District.
6. Bombay Central	Additional Collector Bombay Suburban District.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Bombay Suburban District. 2. Assistant Commissioner (General), Bombay Division, Bombay. 3. Assistant Commissioner, Leave Reserve, Bombay Division, Bombay.

1	2	3
7. Bombay North West	Additional Collector Bombay Suburban District.	4. Special Land Acquisition Officer No. 7, Bombay. 5. Assistant Commissioner (Supply), Bombay Division, Bombay. 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Bombay Suburban District. 2. Additional District Deputy Collector, Bombay Suburban District. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer (National Park), Bombay.
8. Bombay North East	Deputy Commissioner, Bombay Division.	1. Special Land Acquisition Officer No. 5, Bombay. 2. Assistant Commissioner, Rehabilitation, Bombay. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, (Highways), Bombay. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Thana Division, Thana.
9. Bhiwandi.	Collector of Thana.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Panvel Division, Panvel. 2. Administrator, Ulhasnagar. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Baravi Project, Thana. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Bhiwandi Division, Bhiwandi. 5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Haveli Division, Poona.
10. Dahanu	Additional Collector, Thana.	1. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Upper Vaitarna Scheme, Thana. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Dahanu Division, Dahanu. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, 2nd Milk Colony, Dahanu. 4. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Ulhas Valley Project, Thana. 5. District Supply Officer, Nasik.
11. Nasik	Collector of Nasik.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Nasik Division, Nasik. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Niphad Division, Nasik. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, II, Nasik.
12. Malegaon	Collector of Nasik.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Malegaon Division, Malegaon. 2. District Resettlement Officer, Nasik. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Karajwan and Bhojapur Project, Nasik.
13. Nandurbar	Collector of Dhulia.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Dhulia Division, Dhulia. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Nandurbar Division, Nandurbar.

1	2	3
		3. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Dhulia. 4. District Supply Officer, Dhulia.
14. Dhulia . . .	Collector of Dhulia.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Dhulia Division, Dhulia. 2. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Dhulia. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Amalner Division, Amalner. 4. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Jalgaon.
15. Jalgaon . . .	Collector of Jalgaon.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Chalisgaon Division, Chalisgaon. 2. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Jalgaon. 3. Resident Deputy Collector, Jalgaon. 4. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Jalgaon.
16. Buldana . . .	Collector of Buldana.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Jalgaon Division, Jalgaon. 2. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Jalgaon. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Malkapur Division, Malkapur. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Buldana Division, Buldana.
17. Khamgaon . . .	Collector of Buldana.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Mehkar Division, Mehkar. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Khamgaon Division, Khamgaon. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Jalgaon Division, Jalgaon. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Washim Division, Washim.
18. Akola . . .	Collector of Akola.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Akot Division, Akola. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Akola Division, Akot. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Balapur Division, Balapur. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Mangrulpir Division, Mangrulpir. 5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Murtizapur Division, Murtizapur.
19. Amravati . . .	Collector of Amravati.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Daryapur Division, Daryapur. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Achapur, Division, Achalpur. 3. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Amravati. 4. Nazul Officer, Amravati. 5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Amravati Division, Amravati. 6. Sub-Divisional Officer, Chandur Railway.

1	2	3
20. Ramtak	Collector of Nagpur.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Achalpur Division, Achalpur 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Morshi Division, Morshi. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Nagpur Division, Nagpur 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Katol Division, Katol 5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Saoner Division, Saoner. 6. Sub-Divisional Officer, Ramtak Division, Ramtak.
21. Nagpur	Collector of Nagpur.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Umrer Division, Umrer. 2. Special Land Acquisition Officer for Corporation. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Nagpur Improvement Trust, Nagpur. 4. Nazul Officer, Nagpur. 5. City Magistrate, Nagpur. 6. Additional District Magistrate, Nagpur.
22. Bhandara	Collector of Bhandara	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Bhandara Division, Bhandara 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Gondia Division, Gondia. 3. Special Deputy Collector, Land Reforms Bhandara.
23. Chimur	Collector of Bhandara	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sakoli Division, Sakoli. 2. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Bhandara. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Gadchiroli Division, Gadchiroli 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Prerhapuri Division, Prerhapuri 5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Warora Division, Warora.
24. Chanda	Collector of Chanda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional officer, Gadchiroli Division, Gadchiroli. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sironcha Division, Sironcha, (H.Q. Aheri). 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Rajura Division, Rajura. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Chanda Division, Chandrapur. 5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Warora Division, Warora.
25. Wardha	Collector of Wardha	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Arvi Division, Arvi. 2. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Wardha 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Wardha Division, Wardha. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Hinghanghat Division, Hinghanghat

1	2	3
		5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Wani Division, Wani.
		6. Sub-Divisional Officer, Kelapur Division Kelapur.
26. Yeotmal.	Collector of Yeotmal.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Kelapur Division, Kelapur. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Yeotmal Division, Yeotmal. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Darwha Division, Darwha. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Pusad Division, Pusad.
27. Nanded	Collector of Nanded	1. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Collectorate, Nanded. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Nanded Division, Nanded. 3. Resident Deputy Collector, Collectorate, Nanded. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Degloor Division, Degloor. 5. Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Collectorate, Nanded.
28. Latur.	Collector of Osmanabad.	1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Degloor Division, Degloor. 2. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Parbhani. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sailu Division, Sailu. 4. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Osmanabad. 5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Udgir Division, Udgir. 6. Sub-Divisional Officer, Latur Divisions, Latur.
29. Parbhani.	Collector of Parbhani.	1. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Parbhani. 2. Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Parbhani. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Hingoli Division, Hingoli. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sailu Division, Sailu.
30. Jalna	Collector of Aurangabad.	1. Special Deputy Collector, Land Ceiling, Gangapur Sugar Mills, H.Q. Aurangabad. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Jalna Division, Jalna. 3. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Aurangabad. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Bhir Division, Bhir.
31. Aurangabad.	Collector of Aurangabad.	1. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Jaiwadi Project, Aurangabad. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Vaijapur Division, Vaijapur.

1	2	3
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Aurangabad Division, Aurangabad. 4. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Aurangabad.
32. Bhir	Collector of Bhir	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Ambajogai Division, Ambajoga. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Bhir Division, Bhir. 3. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Bhir. 4. Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Bhir.
33. Osmanabad	Collector Osmanabad	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Latur Division, Latur. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Osmanabad Division, Osmanabad. 3. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Osmanabad. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Udgir Division, Udgir. 5. Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Osmanabad.
34. Sholapur	Collector of Sholapur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Osmanabad. 2. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Sholapur. 3. Special Deputy Collector, for Tenancy Appeals, Sholapur. 4. Resident Deputy Collector, Sholapur. 5. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Sholapur. 6. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sholapur Division, Sholapur.
35. Handharpur	Collector of Sholapur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resettlement Officer, Ujjani Project, Sholapur. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Madha Division, Kurduwadi. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sholapur Division, Sholapur. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Pandharpur Division, Pandharpur. 5. Special Deputy Collector (Land Ceiling) for S.M. S.F. and C.A.P. Ltd., Malshiras.
36. Ahmednagar	Collector of Ahmednagar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Parner Division, Ahmednagar. 2. Deputy Collector and Agricultural Land Tribunal, Nagar Taluka, Ahmednagar. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Rahuri Division, Ahmednagar.

1	2	3
37. Kopergaon	Collector of Ahmednagar.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Special Deputy Collector land Ceiling, Belapur Company Ltd., Shirampur. 2. Special Deputy Collector, Land Ceiling, G.S. Mills, No. 1, Kopergaon. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Krish. Vidyapeeth, Rahur. 4. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Ghod Project, Ahmednagar. 5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sangamner Division, Sangamner.
38. Khed	Collector of Poona	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Special Land Acquisition Officer (6), Poona. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Junnar Division, Khed. 3. Assistant Commissioner (Revenue), Poona. 4. Special Land Acquisition Officer (9) Bombay, Poona Road, Poona. 5. Special Land Acquisition Officer (8), Poona. 6. Assistant Commissioner (Leave Reserve), Poona.
39. Poona	Collector of Poona.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Collectorate, Poona. 2. Assistant Commissioner (Land Ceiling), Poona. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer (5), Poona. 4. Assistant Commissioner (Supply), Poona. 5. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Poona City No. 1 Poona. 6. Deputy Collector, Saes Tax Recovery Poona Commissioner's Office, Poona.
40. Baramati	Additional Collector of Poona.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Special Deputy Collector, (Land Ceiling) for B.M. S.S., Malshiras. 2. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Ujjani Project, Sholapur. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, South Central Railway, Poona. 4. Special Land Acquisition Officer (7), Poona. 5. Special Deputy Collector, Land Ceiling, Walchandnagar, Baramati. 6. Sub-Divisional Officer, Baramati Division, Baramati.
1. Satara	Collector of Satara.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Phaltan Division, Phaltan. 2. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Satara.

1	I	2	3
42. Karad		Collector of Satara.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Satara Division, Satara. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Mahabaleshwar Division Mahabaleshwar. 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Mahabaleshwar Division, Mahabaleshwar. 2. Sub-Divisional Officer, Satara Division, Satara. 3. Additional Special Land Acquisition Officer (Koyana Project), Satara. 4. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Warna Project, Khujgaon Dam Islampur. 5. Resettlement Officer, Warna Project, Sangli. (H.Q. Islampur)
43. Sangli		Collector of Sangli	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Walwa Division, Sangli. 2. Special Deputy Collector for Tenancy Appeals, Sangli. 3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Sangli. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Miraj Division, Miraj. 5. Special Land Acquisition Officer (Board Gauge: Miraj). 6. Leave Reserve Deputy Collector, Sangli.
44. Hathanangale		Collector of Kolhapur.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Special Deputy Collector, Land Ceiling, Kolhapur. 2. Deputy Collector and Agricultural Lands Tribunal Hatanangale. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Shahuwadi Division, Shahuwadi. 4. Special Land Acquisition
45. Kolhapur		Collector of Kolhapur	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sawantwadi Division, Sawantwadi. 2. Special Land Acquisition Officer (r), Kolhapur. 3. Sub-Divisional Officer Karvir Division, Kolhapur. 4. Sub-Divisional Officer Gadhadhinglaj Division, Gadhadhinglaj.

[No. 424/MT/70.]

By Order,

K. S. RAJAGOPALAN Secy

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 1970

एस० आी० 4002:—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 21 तथा धारा 22 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 434/महाराष्ट्र/68, तारीख 3 मई, 1968 को अधिकृत करते हुए निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित सारणी के स्तम्भ 1 में विनिर्दिष्ट, महाराष्ट्र राज्य के संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्रों में से प्रत्येक की बाबत:—

(क) उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 में की तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट आफिसर का रिटनिंग आफिसर; तथा

(ख) उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ 3 में की तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टियाँ में विनिर्दिष्ट आफिसर का सहायक रिटनिंग आफिसर नियुक्त करता है।

सारणी

क्रम सं०	तथा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र का नाम	रिटनिंग आफिसर	सहायक रिटनिंग आफिसर
(1)		(2)	(3)
1	राजापुर	कलक्टर, रत्नागिरी	1. उपखंड आफिसर, सावन्तावादी प्रखंड, सावन्तावादी। 2. विशेष उप-कलक्टर, अभिधृति अपील सावन्तावादी। 3. उपखंड आफिसर, रत्नागिरी प्रखंड रत्नागिरी। 4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, रत्नागिरी।
2	रत्नागिरी	कलक्टर, रत्नागिरी	1. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, रत्नागिरी। 2. विशेष उप-कलक्टर अभिधृति अपील, चिपलुन। 3. उपखंड आफिसर, चिपलुन प्रखंड, चिपलुन। 4. उपखंड आफिसर, डपोली प्रखंड, डपोली।
3	कोलाबा	कलक्टर, कोलाबा	1. उपखंड आफिसर महाड प्रखंड, महाड। 2. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर कोलाबा, अलिबेग।

(1)

(2)

(3)

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 4 | मुंबई साउथ | कलक्टर, मुंबई तथा जिला मुंबई उपनगर । | <p>3. उपखंड आफिसर, अलीबेग प्रखंड, अलीबेग ।</p> <p>4. उपखंड आफिसर, पानवेल प्रखंड, पानवेल ।</p> |
| 5 | मुंबई सेंट्रल साउथ | कलक्टर, मुंबई तथा जिला मुंबई उपनगर । | <p>1. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर सं० 2, मुंबई ।</p> <p>2. सहायक आयुक्त (राजस्व), मुंबई प्रखंड, मुंबई ।</p> <p>3. विराय भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, सं० 3 मुंबई ।</p> <p>4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर सं०-4, मुंबई ।</p> |
| 6 | मुंबई सेंट्रल | अपर कलक्टर जिला मुंबई उपनगर । | <p>1. उपखंड आफिसर (विश्वय कर) मुंबई जिला मुंबई उपनगर ।</p> <p>2. भूमि आरक्षण, उप कलक्टर, जिला मुंबई उपनगर ।</p> <p>3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर सं०-4, मुंबई ।</p> <p>4. सहायक/उप कलक्टर तथा आवास सहायक/उप कलक्टर जिला मुंबई, उपनगर ।</p> |
| 7 | मुंबई नार्थ वेस्ट | अपर कलक्टर जिला मुंबई उपनगर | <p>1. अवकाश आरक्षण उप-कलक्टर, जिला मुंबई उपनगर ।</p> <p>2. सहायक आयुक्त (सामान्य) मुंबई प्रखंड, मुंबई ।</p> <p>3. सहायक आयुक्त, अवकाश आरक्षण, मुंबई प्रखंड, मुंबई ।</p> <p>4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर सं०-7, मुंबई ।</p> <p>5. सहायक (आयुक्त आपूर्ति) मुंबई प्रखंड, मुंबई ।</p> <p>1. उपखंड आफिसर, जिला मुंबई, उपनगर ।</p> <p>2. अपर जिला उप-कलक्टर, जिला मुंबई उपनगर ।</p> <p>3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर (नेशनल पार्क) मुंबई ।</p> |

	(1)	(2)	(3)
8	मुंबई नार्थ ईस्ट	उपायुक्त, मुंबई प्रखंड	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर सं०-5, मुंबई । 2. सहायक आयुक्त, पुनर्वासि, मुंबई । 3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, (हाईवेज) मुंबई । 4. उप-खंड आफिसर, थाना प्रखंड, थाना ।
9	भिवंडी	कलक्टर, थाना	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर, पानवेल प्रखंड, पानवेल । 2. प्रशासक, उल्लास नगर । 3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, बुरावी प्रायोजना, थाना । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, भिवंडी प्रखंड, भिवण्डी । 5. उपखंड आफिसर, हवेली प्रखंड, पूना ।
10	दहानु	अपर कलक्टर, थाना	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, प्रवर वेत्राना योजना, थाना । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, दहानु प्रखंड, दहानु । 3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, द्वितीय दुग्ध कालोनी, दहानु । 4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, उल्हास घाटी प्रायोजना, थाना । 5. जिला आपूर्ति आफिसर, नासिक ।
11	नासिक	कलक्टर, नासिक	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर, नासिक प्रखंड, नासिक । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, निफाह प्रखंड, नासिक । 3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर-2, नासिक ।
12	मालेगांव	कलक्टर, नासिक	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर, मालेगांव प्रखंड, मालेगांव । 2. जिला पुनर्वासि आफिसर, नासिक । 3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, करजवन तथा मेजपुर प्रायोजना, नासिक ।

1	2	3
13	नन्दुरबार कलक्टर, धूलिया	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर धूलिया प्रखंड धूलिया । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, नन्दुरबार प्रखंड नन्दुरबार । 3. अवकाश आरक्षण उप-कलक्टर धूलिया । 4. जिला आपूर्ति आफिसर, धूलिया ।
14	धूलिया कलक्टर, धूलिया	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर धूलिया प्रखंड धूलिया । 2. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर धूलिया । 3. उपखंड आफिसर अमलनेर प्रखंड अमलनेर । 4. अवकाश आरक्षण उप-कलक्टर जलगांव ।
15	जलगांव कलक्टर, जलगांव	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर चालिसगांव प्रखंड चालिसगांव । 2. अवकाश आरक्षण उप-कलक्टर जलगांव । 3. आवास उप-कलक्टर जलगांव । 4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर जलगांव ।
16	बुलडाना कलक्टर, बुलडाना	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर जलगांव प्रखंड जलगांव । 2. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर जलगांव । 3. उपखंड आफिसर मालकपूर प्रखंड मालकपूर । 4. उपखंड आफिसर बुलडाना प्रखंड बुलडाना ।
17	खामगांव कलक्टर, बुलडाना	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर मेहकर प्रखंड, मेहकर । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, खामगांव प्रखंड, खामगांव । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, जलगांव प्रखंड, जलगांव । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, बाशिम प्रखंड, बाशिम ।

1	2	3
18 अकोला]	कलक्टर, अकोला,	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर अकोट प्रखंड, अकोला । 2. उपखंड आफिसर अकोला प्रखंड, अकोट । 3. उपखंड आफिसर बालापुर, प्रखंड बालापुर । 4. उपखंड आफिसर मंगरुलपुर प्रखंड मंगरुलपुर । 5. उपखंड आफिसर भुतिजापुर प्रखंड मुतिजापुर ।
19 अमरावती]	कलक्टर, अमरावती ।	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर, दरियापुर प्रखंड दरियापुर । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, अचलपुर प्रखंड, अचलपुर । 3. अवकाश आरक्षण, उप-कलक्टर, अमरावती । 4. नाजुल आफिसर, अमरावती । 5. उपखंड आफिसर अमरावती प्रखंड अमरावती । 6. उपखंड आफिसर चन्द्रुर रेलवे ।
20 रामटेक	कलक्टर, नागपुर	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर, अचलपुर प्रखंड अचलपुर । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, मोरशी प्रखंड मोरशी । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, नागपुर प्रखंड नागपुर । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, कटोल प्रखंड कटोल । 5. उपखंड आफिसर साओनेर प्रखंड साओनेर । 6. उपखंड आफिसर, रामटेक प्रखंड रामकेट ।
21 नागपुर	कलक्टर, नागपुर	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर, उमरेर प्रखंड उमरेर । 2. निगम के विवेक भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर ।

1	2	3
		3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर नागपुर इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट नागपुर 4. नाजुल आफिसर नागपुर। 5. सिटी मजिस्ट्रेट नागपुर। 6. अपर जिला मजिस्ट्रेट नागपुर।
22 भण्डारा	कलेक्टर, भण्डारा	1. उपखंड आफिसर भण्डारा प्रखंड भण्डारा। 2. उपखंड आफिसर, गोन्डिया प्रखंड गोन्डिया। 3. विशेष उप-कलेक्टर, भूमि सुधार, भण्डारा।
23 विमूर	कलेक्टर, भण्डारा	1. उपखंड आफिसर साकोली प्रखंड साकोली। 2. अवकाश आरक्षण उप-कलेक्टर भण्डारा। 3. उपखंड आफिसर गादचिरोली प्रखंड गावचिरोली। 4. उपखंड आफिसर ब्रह्मपुरी प्रखंड ब्रह्मपुरी। 5. उपखंड आफिसर, बरोरा प्रखंड बरोरा।
24 चन्दा	कलेक्टर, चन्दा	1. उपखंड आफिसर गावचिरोली प्रखंड गावचिरोली। 2. उपखंड आफिसर सिरोन्वा प्रखंड सिरोन्वा (हैडक्वार्टर अहेरी)। 3. उपखंड आफिसर राजुरा प्रखंड राजुरा। 4. उपखंड आफिसर चन्दा प्रखंड चन्द्रपुर। 5. उपखंड आफिसर, बरोरा प्रखंड बरोरा।
25 बर्घा	कलेक्टर, बर्घा	1. उपखंड आफिसर, अरबी प्रखंड अरबी। 2. अवकाश आरक्षण उप-कलेक्टर बर्घा। 3. उपखंड आफिसर बर्घा प्रखंड बर्घा।

1	2	3
		4. उपखंड आफिसर हिगनघाट प्रखंड हिगनघाट । 5. उपखंड आफिसर बनी प्रखंड बनी । 6. उपखंड आफिसर केलापुर प्रखंड केलापुर ।
26	योतमल कलक्टर, योतमल	1. उपखंड आफिसर, केलापुर प्रखंड, केलापुर । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, योतमल प्रखंड, योतमल । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, दरवाहा प्रखंड, दरवाहा । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, पुसद प्रखंड, पुसद ।
27	नानदेह कलक्टर, नानदेह	1. अवकाश आरक्षण उप-कलक्टर, कलक्टर नानदेह । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, नानदेह प्रखंड, नानदेह । 3. आवास उप-कलक्टर, कलक्टर, नानदेह । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, देगलूर प्रखंड, देगलूर । 5. उप-कलक्टर, भूमि सुधार कलक्टर नानदेह ।
28	लाटूर कलक्टर, उसमानाबाद	1. उपखंड आफिसर, देगलूर प्रखंड, देगलूर । 2. अवकाश आरक्षण उप-कलक्टर, मरमानी । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, सेलू प्रखंड, सेलू । 4. अवकाश आरक्षण उप-कलक्टर, उसमानाबाद । 5. उपखंड आफिसर, उदगिर प्रखंड, उदगिर । 6. उपखंड आफिसर, लाटूर प्रखंड, लाटूर ।

1	2	3
29	परमनी कलक्टर, परमनी	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. अवकाश आरक्षण उप कलक्टर परमनी । 2. उप कलक्टर, भूमि सुधार परमना, 3. उपखंड आफिसर, हिंगोजी प्रखंड हिंगोजी । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, सेलू प्रखंड, सेलू
30	जालना कलक्टर, जालना	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. विशेष उप कलक्टर, भूमि सीमा, संगपुर शगर मिल्स, हेडक्वार्टर, औरंगाबाद । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, जालना प्रखंड, जालना । 3. अवकाश आरक्षण, उप कलक्टर, औरंगाबाद । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, मिर प्रखंड, मिर ।
31	औरंगाबाद कलक्टर, औरंगाबाद	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, जकवादी प्रायोजना, औरंगाबाद । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, बेजापुर प्रखंड, बेजापुर । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, औरंगाबाद प्रखंड, औरंगाबाद । 4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, औरंगाबाद ।
32	मिर कलक्टर, मिर	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर, अम्बाजोगाई प्रखंड, अम्बाजोगाई । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, मिर प्रखंड, मिर । 3. अवकाश आरक्षण उप कलक्टर, मिर । 4. उप कलक्टर, भूमि सुधार, मिर ।
33	उस्मानाबाद कलक्टर, उस्मानाबाद	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर, लादुर उपखंड, लादुर । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, उस्मानाबाद प्रखंड, उस्मानाबाद ।

1	2	3
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. अवकाश भारक्षण, उप कलक्टर, उस्मानाबाद । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, उदगिर प्रखंड, उदगिर । 5. उप कलक्टर, भूमि सुधार, उस्मानाबाद ।
34 शोलापुर	कलक्टर, शोलापुर	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उप कलक्टर, भूमि सुधार, उस्मानाबाद । 2. अवकाश भारक्षण उप कलक्टर, शोलापुर । 3. विशेष उप कलक्टर, अभिवृत्ति अपील, शोलापुर । 4. आवास उप-कलक्टर, शोलापुर । 5. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर शोलापुर । 6. उपखंड आफिसर, शोलापुर प्रखंड, शोलापुर ।
85 पनढापुर	कलक्टर, शोलापुर	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. पुनर्वासि आफिसर, उज्जैनी प्रयोजना, शोलापुर । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, मदहा प्रखंड, कुरुवाही । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, शोलापुर प्रखंड, शोलापुर । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, पनढारपुर प्रखंड पनढापुर । 5. विशेष उप कलक्टर, (भूमि सीमा) एस० एम० एस० एफ० तथा सी० ए० पी० लिमिटेड, मालशीरस ।
36 अहमदनगर	कलक्टर, अहमदनगर	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. उपखंड आफिसर, पारनेर प्रखंड, अहमदनगर । 2. उप-कलक्टर तथा कृषिभूमि ट्रिब्यूनल, नगर तालुका, अहमदनगर । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, राठुरी प्रखंड अहमदनगर ।

1	2	3
37	कोपरगांव	कलक्टर, अहमदनगर
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. विशेष उप कलक्टर, भूमि सीमा, वेलापुर कम्पनी लि०, श्री रामपुर। 2. विशेष उप कलक्टर, भूमि सीमा, जी० एम० मिन्स सं० 1, कोपरगांव। 3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, कृषि विद्यापीठ राहुरी। 4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर होड प्रायोजना, अहमदनगर। 5. उपखंड आफिसर, संगमनेर प्रखंड, संगमनेर।
38	खेड	कलक्टर, पूना
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, सं० (6) पूना। 2. उपखंड आफिसर, जुनार प्रखंड, खेड। 3. सहायक आयुक्त (राजस्व) पूना। 4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर (9), मुंबई, पूना रोड, पूना। 5. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर सं० (8) पूना। 6. सहायक आयुक्त (अवकाश आ-रक्षण), पूना।
39	पून 1	कलक्टर, पूना
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. अवकाश आरक्षण कलक्टर, कल-क्टर, पूना। 2. सहायक आयुक्त (भूमि सीमा), पूना। 3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, (5), पूना। 4. सहायक आयुक्त (आपूर्ति), पूना। 5. उपखंड मजिस्ट्रेट पूना सिटी सं० 1, पूना। 6. उप-कलक्टर, विक्रयकर वसूली, पूना, आयुक्त का कार्यालय, पूना।
40	बारामती	अपर कलक्टर, पूना
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. विशेष उप-कलक्टर, (भूमि सीमा) बी० एस० एस० एस० मालशिरस। 2. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर उज्जैनी, प्रायोजना, शीलापुर।

1	2	3
		3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, साउथ सेंट्रल रेलवे, पूना । 4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर (7), पूना । 5. विशेष उप-कलक्टर, भूमि सीमा, बालभन्द नगर, बारामती । 6. उपखंड आफिसर, बारामती प्रखंड, बारामती ।
41	सतारा कलक्टर, सतारा	1. उपखंड आफिसर, फाल्टन प्रखंड, फाल्टन । 2. अवकाश आरक्षण उप कलक्टर, सतारा । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, सतारा प्रखंड, सतारा । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, महाबलेश्वर प्रखंड, महाबलेश्वर ।
42	कहलू कलक्टर, सतारा	1. उपखंड आफिसर, महाबलेश्वर, प्रखंड, महाबलेश्वर । 2. उपखंड आफिसर, सतारा प्रखंड, सतारा । 3. अपर विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, (कोन्या प्रायोजना), सतारा । 4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, बरन प्रायोजना खुजगांव, बांध, इस्लामपुर । 5. पुनर्वासि आफिसर, वरना प्रायोजना सांगली, (हैडक्वार्टर, इस्लामपुर) ।
43	सांगली कलक्टर, सांगली	1. उपखंड आफिसर, कलवा प्रखंड, सांगली । 2. विशेष उप-कलक्टर अभिवृत्ति अपील, सांगली । 3. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, सांगली । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, मिराज प्रखण्ड, मिराज ।

1	2	3
		5. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर, (बड़ी लाइन) मिराज ।
		6. भूमि आरक्षण, उप कलक्टर, सांगली ।
44	हतकाननगाले कलक्टर, कोल्हापुर	1. विशेष उप कलक्टर, भूमि सीमा कोल्हापुर । 2. उप कलक्टर तथा भूमि कृषि भूमि ट्रिब्यूनल हतकाननगाले । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, शाहुवादी प्रखंड, शाहुवादी । 4. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर (1), कोल्हापुर ।
45	कोल्हापुर कलक्टर, कोल्हापुर	1. उपखंड आफिसर, सावन्तवादी प्रखंड, सावन्तवादी । 2. विशेष भूमि अधिग्रहण आफिसर (1), कोल्हापुर । 3. उपखंड आफिसर, कारविर प्रखंड, कोल्हापुर । 4. उपखंड आफिसर, गडाहिगलाज प्रखंड, गडाहिगलाज ।

[सं 434/एम०टी०/70]

आदेश से,

के० एम० राजगोपालन, सचिव ।

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 30th October 1970

S.O. 4003.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kamalapati Tripathi S/o. Shri Bechu R/o. village Bhakora, Post Office Domanpur, District Varanasi Uttar Pradesh a contesting candidate for mid-term general election 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 252-Aurai Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kamalapati Tripathi, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/252/69(153).]

आदेशों

नई दिल्ली, 30 अक्टूबर, 1970

एस० ओ० 4003.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 252-ओराई सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी सुपुत्र श्री बन्धु निवासी गाव भकोड़ा, डा० डोमनपुर, जिला वाराणसी, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा, दाखिल करने में असफल रहे है ;

2. और यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

3. अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[स० उ० प्र०-वि०स०/252/69(153)]

New Delhi, the 11th November 1970

S.O. 4004—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mohammad Hafiz, s/o. Shri Faridan, R/o village and Post Office Karanda, District Ghazipur, Uttar Pradesh, a contesting candidate for mid-term general election 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 237-Zamania Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2 And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure,

3 Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mohammad Hafiz, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order

[No UP-LA/237/69(155).]

नई दिल्ली, 11 नवम्बर, 1970

एस० ओ० 4004.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 237-जमानिया सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मोहम्मद हफीज सुपुत्र श्री फारीद ग्राम व पोस्ट करंडा, जिला गाजीपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे है ;

2 और अतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

3. अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मोहम्मद हफीज को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य

की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं०उ०प्र-वि०/237/69/(155)]

S.O. 4005.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Malikhan S/o. Shri Harkanath, village Bajna, Post Office Bajna, District Mathura, Uttar Pradesh a contesting candidate for Mid-term general election 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 368-Mat Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Malikhan, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/368/69 (156).]

एस० ओ० 4005—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मम्हावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 368—माट सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मलिखान सुपुत्र श्री हरकान्त राम बाजना, डाकखाना बाजना, जिला मथुरा उत्तर प्रदेश लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित निर्वाचन लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है ; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

3. अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10—क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मलिखान को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं०उ०प्र०—वि०स०/368/69(156)]

New Delhi, the 18th November 1970

S.O. 4006.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Narain Singh S/o. Shri Fauji Singh, R/o. village Hasnapur, Post Office Pilsan, District Sitapur, Uttar Pradesh a contesting candidate for Mid-term election 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 81-Misrikh Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Narain Singh, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/81/69(157).]

नई दिल्ली, 18 नवम्बर, 1970

एस० ओ० 4006.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 81-मिसरिख सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री नरायन सिंह सुपुत्र श्री फौजी सिंह निवासी ग्राम हसनपुर, पोस्ट पिसावा जिला सीतापुर, उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायौचित्य नहीं है ;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण से निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री नरायन सिंह को संसद के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं.उ०प्र०-वि०स० 81/69(157)]

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1970

S.O. 4007.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Prakash Chandra S/o. Shri Avadh Behari Lal, R/o. Bihar. Thana Mohamdabad, Tahsil and District Farrukhabad, Uttar Pradesh a contesting candidate for Mid-term election 1969 to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 316-Kamalganj Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Prakash Chandra, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/316/69(158).]

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1970

एस० ओ० 4007.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मध्यावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 316-कमलगंज सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री प्रकाशचन्द्र सुपुत्र श्री अवध विहारी लाल निवासी बिहार थाना मोहम्मदाबाद, तहसील और जिला फर्रुखाबाद उत्तर प्रदेश, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायौचित्य नहीं है ;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री प्रकाश चन्द्र को संसद् के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए, इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं०उ०प्र०-वि०स०/316/69(158)]

New Delhi, the 30th November 1970

S.O. 4008.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kripal Singh, S/o. Shri Nagine, R/o. village Jitholi, Post Office Moukhas, District Meerut, Uttar Pradesh a contesting candidate for election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 396-Kithore Assembly Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notices has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kripal Singh, to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. UP-LA/396/69(163).]

By Order,

A. N. SEN, Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 नवम्बर, 1970

एस० प्रो० 4008.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए मन्दावधि साधारण निर्वाचन 1969 के लिए 396-किठोड़ा सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री कृपाल सिंह सुपुत्र श्री नगीने निवासी गांव जिठौली डाकघर मऊ खामस जिला मेरठ उत्तर प्रदेश, लोकप्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

2. और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे मन्दावधि सूचना दिए जाने पर भी अपनी इन अनकम्पना के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है; तथा निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस अनकम्पना के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्येय नहीं है ;

3. अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री कृपाल सिंह को संसद् के दोनों सदनों में से किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं०उ०प्र०-वि०स०/396/69(163)]

आदेश से,

ए० एन० सेन, सचिव ।

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 26th November 1970

S.O. 4009.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of article 239 of the Constitution and all other powers enabling him in that behalf, the President hereby makes the following further amendment in the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. F. 22/11/59-ANL, dated the 2nd January, 1960 (hereinafter referred to as the said notification), as amended by the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. 4/60/61-ANL, dated the 2nd February, 1963 and Notification No. 4/107/64-ANL, dated the 26th November, 1964, namely:—

In the said notification,—

- (i) for the entry “(bb) the Secretary (Finance) to the Chief Commissioner; or”, the entry “(bb) Finance Secretary, Andaman and Nicobar Administration; or” shall be substituted and shall be deemed to have been substituted with effect from the 22nd April, 1970;
- (ii) for the entry “(dd) the secretary (Judicial) to the Chief Commissioner; or”, the entry “(dd) the Judicial Secretary, Andaman and Nicobar Administration; or” shall be substituted and shall be deemed to have been substituted with effect from the 22nd April 1970;
- (iii) for the entry “(e) an Assistant Secretary to the Chief Commissioner”; the entry “(e) an Assistant Secretary to the Andaman and Nicobar Administration; or” shall be substituted and shall be deemed to have been substituted with effect from the 22nd April, 1970.

[No. 4/70/70-ANL.]

गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 26 नवम्बर, 1970

एस० नो० 4009 :—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 239 के खण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों तथा उस संबंध में उन्हें समर्थ करने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, गृह मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या एफ० 22/11/59-ए० एन० एल० दिनांक 2 जनवरी 1960 में (उसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिसूचना के रूप में विधिष्ट), जिसे गृह मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या 4/60/61-ए० एन० एल० दिनांक 2 फरवरी 1963 और अधिसूचना संख्या 4/107/64-ए० एन० एल० दिनांक 26 नवम्बर, 1964 द्वारा संशोधित किया गया था, एतद् द्वारा निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करते हैं ; अर्थात् उक्त अधिसूचना में

(1) प्रविष्टि (बी बी) मुख्य आयुक्त के सचिव (वित्त) : या के स्थान पर प्रविष्टि (बी बी) वित्त सचिव, अंडमान और निकोबार प्रशासन ; या प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी और यह 22 अप्रैल 1970 से प्रतिस्थापित की गई समझी जायेगी।

(2) प्रविष्टि (डी डी) मुख्य आयुक्त के सचिव (न्यायिक) ; या के स्थान पर प्रविष्टि (डी डी) न्यायिक सचिव, अंडमान और निकोबार प्रशासन ; या प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी और यह 22 अप्रैल 1970 से प्रतिस्थापित की गई समझी जायेगी।

(3) प्रविष्टि “(ई) मुख्य आयुक्त के सहायक सचिव के स्थान पर प्रविष्टि” (ई) सहायक सचिव, अंडमान और निकोबार प्रशासन ; या प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी और यह 22 अप्रैल 1970 से प्रतिस्थापित की गई समझी जायेगी।

[सं० 4/70/70-ए० एन० एल०]

New Delhi, the 4th December 1970

S.O. 4010.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of article 258 of the Constitution, the President, with the consent of the State Government of West Bengal, hereby entrusts to the Legal Remembrancer to that Government the functions of the Public Prosecutor for conducting the cases of the Administration

of the Union territory of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands before the High Court at Calcutta in its appellate or revisional jurisdiction and appoints him under sub-section (1) of section 492 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (5 of 1898) as a Public Prosecutor in that behalf with immediate effect.

[No. 30/40/69-ANL.]

H. S. DUBEY, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली 1, 4 दिसम्बर, 1970

एस० आ० 4010.—संविधान के अनुच्छेद 258 के खण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राष्ट्रपति, पश्चिमी बंगाल की राज्य सरकार की सहमति से, कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय में अपील या पुनरीक्षण क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आने वाले अंडमान और निकोबार द्वीप समूह के संघ-शासित क्षेत्र के प्रशासन के मामलों के संचालन के लिए लोक अभियोजक के कार्यों को एतद् द्वारा उस सरकार के विधि परामर्शी को सौंपते हैं और उन्हें उस संबंध में दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता 1898 (1898 का 5) की धारा 492 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन तत्काल से लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करते हैं।

[सं० 30/40/69-ए०एन०एल०]

एच० एस० दुबे, उप-सचिव।

CABINET SECRETARIAT

(Department of Personnel)

New Delhi, the 15th December 1970

S.O. 4011.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 492 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (5 of 1898), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. Ramaswamy, Advocate, Madras, as a Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of the accused in the case RC.6/EOW/67-Madras, in the original, appellate and revisional courts.

[No. 225/39/70-AVD(II).]

मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय

(कार्मिक विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4011:—दण्ड प्रक्रिया संहिता 1898 (1898 का 5) की धारा 492 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री के० रामस्वामी अधिवक्ता, मद्रास को, मूल, अपील और पुनरीक्षण न्यायालयों में, वाद आरसी 6 ई० आ० डब्ल्यू० 67-मद्रास में अभियुक्त पर अभियोजन संचालन करने के लिए लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 225/39/70 ए० वी० डी० (II)]

S.O. 4012.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 492 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (5 of 1898), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri T. P. Mathew, retired Senior P.P., S.P.E. Cochin as a Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of the accused in the cases RC 39/65 and 19/67-of EOW—Madras, in the original, appellate and revisional courts.

[No. 225/41/70-AVD(II)]

B. C. VANJANI, Under Secy.

का० आ० 4012:—दण्ड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1898 (1898 का 5) की धारा 492 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री टी० पी० मैथ्यू, सेवा निवृत्त ज्येष्ठ लोक अभियोजक, विशेष पुलिस स्थापन, कोचीन की मूल, अपील और पुनरीक्षण न्यायालयों में, वाद और सी-39/65 और 19/67 ई ओ डब्ल्यू—मद्रास में, अभियुक्त पर अभियोजन चलाने के लिए लोक अभियोजन के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 225/41/70 ए० बी० डी० (II)]

बी० सी० बंजानी, अपर सचिव।

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 25th November 1970

S.O. 4013.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the All India Services Act, 1951 (61 of 1952) and of all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Central Government, after consultation with the Governments of the States concerned, hereby makes the following rules further to amend to Civil Service Regulations,

1. (1) These rules may be called the Civil Service (Sixth Amendment) Regulations, 1970.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Civil Service Regulations, in clause (a) of Article 565, after the Note, the following Explanation shall be inserted, namely:—

“Explanation.—For the purposes of this clause, the expression “the date of his arrival in India”, with reference to an officer of the Indian Civil Service who was recruited and trained in India, means the date on which such officer signed the covenant.”

[No. 7(11)-E.V/70.]

S.O. 4014.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the All-India Services Act, 1951 (61 of 1951) and of all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Central Government, after consultation with the Governments of the States concerned hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Fundamental Rules, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called Fundamental (Seventh Amendment) Rules, 1970.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Fundamental Rules, in clause (f) of Rule 56, after the Note, the following Explanation shall be inserted, namely:—

“Explanation.—For the purposes of this clause, the expression “the date of his arrival in India”, with reference to a member of the Indian Civil Service who was recruited and trained in India, means the date on which such member signed the covenant.”

[No. 7(11)-E.V/70.]

MEHAR SINGH, Under Secy.

(Department of Banking)
New Delhi, the 11th December 1970

S.O. 4015.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 4th December, 1970.

BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	5,72,25,000
		Rupee Coin	3,26,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,77,000
		Bills Purchased and Discounted:—	
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	172,00,00,000	(a) Internal
		(b) External
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	18,20,31,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	37,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad*	111,30,54,000
		Investments**	100,94,76,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund ,	95,00,00,000	(i) Central Government
		(ii) State Governments @	140,29,42,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	
Deposits:—		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	149,92,50,000
(a) Government—		(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	284,81,81,000
(i) Central Government	52,05,83,000	(iii) Others	2,46,25,000
(ii) State Governments	8,39,08,000		

		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund —	
(d) Banks—		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	180,90,36,000	(i) State Governments	34,33,19,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	8,07,96,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks	21,72,21,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	71,66,000	(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	..
(iv) Other Banks	40,06,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	9,57,02,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund —	
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	
			5,36,57,000
(c) Others	115,47,27,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund —	
Bills Payable	50,19,23,000	(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	26,76,71,000
Other Liabilities	71,29,52,000	(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
		Other Assets	35,00,40,000
	Rupees		Rupees
	946,50,97,000		946,50,97,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 56,88,25,000/- advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 9th day of December, 1970.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 4th day of December 1970

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	5,72,25,000		Gold Coin and Bullion:—		
			(a) Held in India	182,53,11,000	
Notes in circulation	3997,43,91,000		(b) Held outside India	
Total Notes issued		4003,18,16,000	Foreign Securities	376,42,00,000	
			TOTAL		558,95,11,000
			Rupee Coin		36,89,96,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		3387,33,09,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper
TOTAL LIABILITIES		4003,18,16,000	TOTAL ASSETS		4003,18,16,000

Dated the 9th day of December, 1970.

[No. F.3(3)-BC/70.]

R. K. HAZARI,

Dy. Governor.

K. YESURATNAM, Under Secy.

(बैंकिंग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 11 दिसम्बर, 1970

एस० ओ० 4015.—4 दिसम्बर, 1970 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये
चुकता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	5,72,25,000
आरक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	3,26,000
		छोटा सिक्का	3,77,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	172,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल :—	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि	37,00,00,000	(क) देशी
		(ख) विदेशी
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घ कालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	95,00,00,000	(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	18,20,31,000
जमा राशियां :—		विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया*	111,30,54,000
(क) सरकारी		निवेश*	100,94,76,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	52,05,83,000	ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	8,39,08,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को
		(ii) राज्य सरकारों को@	140,29,42,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	180,90,36,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को†	149,92,50,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	8,07,96,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को††	284,81,81,000
		(iii) दूसरों को	2,46,25,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये
(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :—			
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	71,66,000	(i) राज्य सरकारों को	34,33,19,000
(iv) ग्राम्य बैंक	40,06,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	21,72,21,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	..
(ग) ग्राम्य	115,47,27,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबचरों में निवेश	9,57,02,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण	
		और अग्रिम :—	
देय बिल	50,19,23,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	5,36,57,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से	
		ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश :—	
अन्य देयताएं	71,29,52,000	(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	26,76,71,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश	..
		अन्य आस्तियां	35,00,40,000
	रुपये 946,50,97,000		रुपये 946,50,97,000

*नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

**राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों के अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

†रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17 (4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को मियादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 56,88,25,000 रु० शामिल हैं।

‡राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

तारीख : 9 दिसम्बर, 1970

रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में दिसम्बर, 1970 की 4 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिये लेखा

इशू विभाग

वैयक्तिक	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए			सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :—		
नोट	5,72,25,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,11,000	
संचालन में नोट	3997,45,91,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
जारी किए गए कुल नोट		4003,18,16,000	विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां जोड़	376,42,00,000	558,95,11,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		56,89,96,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां		3387,33,09,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र		
कुल वैयक्तिक		4003,18,16,000	कुल आस्तियां		4003,18,16,000

तारीख 9 दिसम्बर, 1970

[सं० एफ० 3(3)-बी० सी०/70]

अरि० के० हजारी,
डिप्टी गवर्नर ।

क० येसूरत्तम, अवरसचिव ।

(Department of Banking)

(Corporations Branch)

New Delhi, the 8th December 1970

S.O. 4016.—In pursuance of sub-section (2) of Section 21 of the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948 (15 of 1948), the Central Government, on the recommendations of the Board of Directors of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India hereby fixes 5 per cent per annum as the rate of interest payable on the bonds to be issued by the said Corporation in January, 1971 and maturing on the 1st January, 1972.

[No. F. 2(60)-CORP/70.]

M. K. VENKATACHALAM, Jt. Secy.

(बैंकिंग विभाग)

(कारपोरेशन अनुभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 दिसम्बर, 1970

क्र० आ० 4016—औद्योगिक वित्त निगम अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 15वें) की धारा 21 की उपधारा (2) के अनुसार केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय औद्योगिक वित्त निगम के निदेशक बोर्ड की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा यह निर्धारित करती है कि उक्त निगम द्वारा जनवरी 1971 में जारी किये जाने वाले और पहली जनवरी 1972 को भुगतान के लिए परिपक्व हो जाने वाले बाण्डों पर देय ब्याज की दर 5 प्रतिशत प्रतिवर्ष होगी।

[सं० एफ० 2(60)—कारपोरेशन/70.]

एम० के० वैकटाचलम, संयुक्त सचिव।

(Department of Revenue and Insurance)

New Delhi, the 30th November 1970

S.O. 4017.—Whereas Shri S. Rangarajan formerly General Manager, Oriental Fire and General Insurance Company, Bombay, who was appointed as a member of the Executive Committee of the General Insurance Council by the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) No. 51(21)Ins.I/67 dated the 31st January, 1970, has resigned from the membership of the said Committee.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 64G of the Insurance Act, 1938 (4 of 1938), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri G. V. Jannah, General Manager, Oriental Fire and General Insurance Company Limited, Oriental Buildings, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay, to be a member of the said Executive Committee of the General Insurance Council in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri S. Rangarajan.

[No. F. 51(21)Ins.I/67.]

M. L. WADHAWAN, Dy. Secy.

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 नवम्बर, 1970

क्र० आ० 4017:—यतः श्री एस रंगराजन, भूतपूर्व महाप्रबन्धक, ओरियंटल फायर एण्ड जनरल इन्श्योरेन्स कम्पनी मुम्बई, जिसे भारत सरकार के वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व और बीमा विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० 51(21) बीमा I/67 तारीख 31 जनवरी, 1970 द्वारा जनरल इन्श्योरेन्स कौंसिल की कार्यपालिका समिति के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त किया गया था, ने उक्त समिति की सदस्यता से पद त्याग कर दिया है ;

अतः, अब, बीमा अधिनियम, 1938 (1938 का 4) की धारा 64छ की उपधारा (2) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री जी० वी० जन्नाह, महाप्रबन्धक, ओरियन्टल फायर एण्ड जनरल इश्योरेन्स कम्पनी लिमिटेड, ओरियन्टल बिल्डिंगज, महात्मा गांधी रोड, मुम्बई को श्री एस० रंगराजन के पद त्याग द्वारा हुई रिक्ति में जनरल इश्योरेन्स कौंसिल की उक्त कार्यपालिका समिति का सदस्य होने के लिए नामनिर्देशित करती है।

[स० एफ० 51(21)-बीमा० I/67]]

एम० एल० वाघावन, उप सचिव।

(Department of Revenue and Insurance)

CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 26th December 1970

S.O. 4018.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 157, read with clause (i) of sub-section (2) of section 158, of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby makes the following regulations, namely:—

1. **Short title and commencement.**—(1) These regulations may be called the Levy of Fees (Customs Documents) Regulations, 1970.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. **Definitions**—In these regulations, unless the context otherwise requires:—

(a) "Act" means the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962);

(b) "Customs Document" means a document used in compliance with the provisions of the Act and includes a bill of entry, shipping bill, bill of export, import manifest, import report, export manifest export report, bill of transshipment, baggage declaration, show cause notice and any order passed under the Act.

(c) "Section" means Section of the Act.

3. **Levy of fees.**—The proper officer shall, for the purpose specified in column (1) of the Table below, levy fees on a custom document at the rate specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) thereof, namely:—

THE TABLE

PURPOSE	RATE
1. Amendment of import manifest or export manifest including supplementation thereof.	One rupee for each line of the manifest.
2. Supply of certified copies of:—	
(a) a bill of entry, if the request is made prior to the passing of an order under section 46 or section 60.	Five rupees per copy
(b) a customs document relating to imports other than that referred to in item (a).	Ten rupees per copy
(c) a shipping bill, if the request is made prior to the passing of an order under section 51	Two rupees per copy.
(d) a customs document relating to exports other than that referred to in item (c).	Five rupees per copy.

4. Amendment of Import manifest to be exempt from payment of fees in certain cases.—No fees shall be levied under these regulations in respect of an import manifest.

- (a) when the manifest is supplemented with entries relating to ports which have not been covered by the manifest;
- (b) which is amended or supplemented in respect of goods which are articles of baggage.

[No 106-Cus./F. No. 1/17/67-Cus.VI.]

J. DATTA, Dy. Secy.

(राजस्व और वीमा विभाग)

सीमा शुल्क

नई दिल्ली 26 दिसम्बर 1970

का० पा० 4018:—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम की धारा 158 की उधारा (2) के खण्ड (1) के साथ पठित धारा 157 की उपधारा (2) क रुख (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क और सीमा शुल्क बोर्ड एतद्द्वारा निम्नलिखित विनियम बनाता है, अर्थात् :—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ (1) ये विनियम फीस उद्ग्रहण (सीमा शुल्क दस्तावेज) विनियम, 1970 बहे जा सकेंगे।
- (2) ये शासकीय राजपत्र में अपने प्रकाशन की तारीख को पठित होंगे।
2. परिभाषाएं :— इन विनियमों में जब तक कि संदर्भ से अन्यथा अपेक्षित न हो :—
 - (क) 'अधिनियम' से सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) अभिप्रेत है,
 - (ख) "सीमा शुल्क दस्तावेज" से अधिनियम के उक्तधर्मा के अनुपालन में प्रयुक्त कोई दस्तावेज अभिप्रेत है और इसमें आयात पत्र, पोत परिवहन बिल, निर्यात बिल, आयात वहन पत्र, आयात रिपोर्ट, निर्यात वहन-पत्र, निर्यात रिपोर्ट, यातायात बिल सामान घोषणा, हेतुक दर्शित करने के लिए सूचना या अधिनियम के अधीन पारित कोई आदेश सम्मिलित है;
 - (ग) "धारा" से अधिनियम की धारा अभिप्रेत है।

3. फीस उद्ग्रहण :— निम्न सारणी के स्वम्भ (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रयोजन के लिए, सम्बन्धित अधिकारी, सीमा शुल्क दस्तावेज पर उसके स्वम्भ (2) में तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट दर पर फीस उद्ग्रहीत करेगा :—

सारणी

प्रयोजन	दर
1. आयात वहन पत्र या निर्यात वहन पत्र का, जिसमें उसका अनुपूरण सम्मिलित है, संशोधन	वहन-पत्र को प्रत्येक पंक्ति के लिए एक रुपया
2. निम्नलिखित की प्रमाणित प्रति देने के लिए :—	
(क) आयात पत्र यदि प्रार्थना धारा 46 या धारा 60 के अधीन आदेश पारित करने से पूर्व की गई है,	पांच रुपए प्रति, प्रति

प्रयोजन

दर

- (ख) मद (क) में निर्दिष्ट दस्तावेज से भिन्न, आयात से दस रुपए प्रति, प्रति सम्बन्धित सीमा शुल्क दस्तावेज
- (ग) पोत परिवहन बिल, यदि प्रार्थना द्वारा 51 के अधीन दो रुपये प्रति, प्रति आदेश पारित करने से पूर्व की गई है।
- (घ) मद (ग) में निर्दिष्ट दस्तावेज से भिन्न, निर्यात से सम्बन्धित पाँच रुपए प्रति, प्रति सीमा शुल्क दस्तावेज।

4 कतिपय बशायों में आयात वहन पत्र के संशोधन का फीस क संभाव से छूट प्राप्त होना :-

इन विनियमों के अधीन किसी आयात वहन पत्र की बाबत कोई फीस उद्गृहीत नहीं होगी यदि -

- (क) जब वहन पत्र, पत्तनों से सम्बन्धित ऐसी प्रविष्टियों, जो वहन पत्र में नहीं आती, अनुप्राप्ति है;
- (ख) जो उक्त माल को बाबत संशोधित या अनुपूरित हैं, जो सामान की वस्तुएं हैं।

[सं० 106-सी० शु० 1/17/67-सी० शु० 6]

ज्योतिर्मय दत्त, उप सचिव।

CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE : NEW DELHI.

CUSTOMS

New Delhi and May 1970

S.O. 4019—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section 34 of Section 2 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) the Collector of Central Excise, Delhi having been appointed as Collector of Customs with the jurisdiction of the Delhi Central Excise Collectorate, hereby, assigns to the officers of a grade above the rank of the officers mentioned in column (1) of the Schedule below, the functions of the "Proper Officer" referred to in the various sections of the Customs Act, 1962 given in the corresponding entry in column 2 of the said Schedule.

SCHEDULE

(1)	(2)
Assistant Collector of Customs and Central Excise.	22(3)(b), 33, 59 (Proviso), 61, 73, 85 and 86(2).
Superintendent of Customs and Central Excise/Appraisers.	18, 19, 21, 22(3) (a), 27(3) 45(2) (a)(b), 46, 48, 54, 60, 64, 68, 72(1)(d), 72(2), 80, 111(1) 113 (k), 115(d), 129(2), 142, 149.
Inspectors of Customs and Central Excise.	17, 30(1) (a) and (3), 31 (1) and (2), 32, 39, 40, 41, 42, 47, 50, 51, 62, 77, 79, 83, 144, 145.
Sub-Inspectors of Customs and Central Excise.	34, 35, 37, and 38.

[C. No. VIII(Hqrs.) 1/7/66]

R, PRASAD, Collector.

केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क समाहर्ता का कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली

सीमाशुल्क

नई दिल्ली, 2 मई 1970

का० आ० 4019—सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 2 की खण्ड 34 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क समाहर्ता दिल्ली को केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क समाहर्ता कार्यालय दिल्ली के क्षेत्राधिकार में सीमाशुल्क समाहर्ता के रूप में नियुक्त किये जाने पर तदनसार अधिकारी तथा अधिकारियों की श्रेणी से ऊपर वालों को जिनका उल्लेख निम्न अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 1 में है, सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम 1962 की विविध धाराओं में उचित अधिकारी के कार्य सौंपता है, जिनका उल्लेख निम्न अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 में किया गया है।

अनुसूची

(1)	(2)
सहायक समाहर्ता सीमाशुल्क तथा उत्पादन कर	22(3)(b), 33, 59 (Proviso), 61, 73, 85 and 86(2)।
अधीक्षक सीमाशुल्क तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पादन कर मूल्य निरूपक	18, 19, 21, 22(3)(a), 27(3), 45(2)(a)(b), 46, 48, 54, 60, 64, 67, 68, 72(1)(d), 72(2), 80, 111(O), 113(k), 115 (d), 129 (2), 149
निरीक्षक सीमाशुल्क तथा उत्पादन कर	17, 30 (1) (a) (3), 31 (3) and (2), 32, 39, 40, 41, 42, 47, 50 51, 62, 77, 79, 83, 144, 145।
उपनिरीक्षक सीमाशुल्क तथा उत्पादन कर	34, 35, 37 and 38।

[सं० सो० VIII (मुख्यालय) 1/7/66]

ह० भार० प्रसाद, समाहर्ता

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND MINES AND METALS

(Department of Petroleum and Chemicals)

New Delhi, the 28th November 1970

S.O. 4020.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 19 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), the Central Government hereby notifies that in S.O. No. 1223 dated 17th March, 1970 in place of item 4 of the Schedule thereof, the following may be substituted namely:

“District Inspectors of Prohibition and Excise”.

[No. 4(2)/68/Ch.I.]

J. A. CHOWDHURY, Under Secy.

(Department of Petroleum & Chemicals)

New Delhi, the 2nd December 1970

S.O. 4021.—Whereas by the notification of Government of India as shown in the schedule appended hereto and issued under sub-section (i) of section 6 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962, the Right of User has been acquired in the lands specified in the schedule appended thereto for the transport of petroleum from drill site No. SBB to Sobhasan-1 in Mehsana oil field in Gujarat State.

And whereas, the Oil & Natural Gas Commission has terminated the operations referred to in clause (i) of section 7 of the said Act on 29th December, 1969.

Now therefore, under Rules 4 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of user in Land) Rules 1963, the Competent Authority hereby notifies the said date as the date of termination of operations referred to above.

SCHEDULE

Termination of Operation of pipeline from Drill site No. SBB to Sobhasan-1.

Name of Ministry	Village	S.O. No.	Date of publication in the Gazette of India	Date of termination of operation
Petroleum & Chemicals	HEBUVA	2400	18.7.70	29.12.1969

[No. 11(1)/70 Lab. & Legis.]

पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन और खान तथा धातु मंत्रालय

(पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 2 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० प्रा० 4021.—यतः इस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट और पेट्रोलियम पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रकाशित भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना द्वारा गुजरात राज्य के मेहसाना तेल क्षेत्र में व्यघन स्थल संख्या एस एस बी से सोमासन-1 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए उस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित कर लिया गया है।

और यतः तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग ने 29-12-1969 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उप धारा (1) के खण्ड (1) में निर्दिष्ट संक्रिया को पर्यवसित कर दिया है। अब, अतः पेट्रोलियम पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) नियमावली 1963, के नियम 4 के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी उक्त तारीख को, ऊपर निर्दिष्ट संक्रिया के पर्यवसान के रूप में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

अनुसूची

व्यघन स्थल संख्या एस एस बी से सीमासन-1 तक पाइपलाइन की संक्रिया का पर्यवसान

मंत्रालय का नाम	गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख	संक्रिया के पर्यवसान की तारीख
पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन	हेबूवा	2400	18-7-70	29-12-1969

[संख्या 11(1)/70, लेबर एण्ड लेजिस]

New Delhi, the 4th December 1970

S.O. 4022.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D.S.-BDO to BDA-GGS-1-line, Nawagam Oil field in Gujarat State, Pipelines, should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission;

And Whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such Pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of the section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of User therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Baroda-9.

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

For laying pipeline from well No. BDO to BBA-GGS-1 line.

State : Gujarat

District : Kaira

Taluka : Natar

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	P. Are
Nawagam	636/1	0	1	00
	635	0	0	50
	629	0	3	75
	630/4	0	4	25
	620	0	8	00
	631/2	0	1	50
	621/2	0	2	75
	621/4	0	1	50

[No. 29(7)/68-10C/Lab. & Legis.]

M. V. S. PRASADA RAU, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 दिसम्बर, 1970

क्र० आ० 4022.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में नवांगाम तेल क्षेत्र कुंआ संख्या बी डी ओ से बी बी ए—जी जी एस लाइन तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पाबद्ध अनसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः, अब, पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसम उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करते का अपना आशय एत द्वारा घोषित किया है।

अर्थात् कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाते के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, भवरपुरा रोड, बरीदाबाद की इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिशः हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की माफत।

अनुसूची

कुंभा संख्या बी डी ओ से बी बी ए-जी जी एस। तक पाइप लाइन बिठाने हेतु

राज्य- गुजरात	जिला कौर			तालुका- मातर	
गांव	सर्वेक्षण संख्या	हेक्टर	आर	पी आर	
नवा गाम	636/1	0	1	00	
	633	0	0	50	
	629.	0	3	75	
	630/4	0	4	25	
	620.	0	8	00	
	631/2	0	1	50	
	621/2	0	2	75	
	621/4	0	1	50	

[संख्या 29(7)/68-आई ओ सी/लेबर एण्ड लेजिस]

म० वे० शिव प्रसाद राव, अव्वर सचिव।

(Department of Petroleum and Chemicals)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd December 1970

S.O. 4023.—In pursuance of paragraphs 22 and 23 of the Drugs (Prices Control) Order, 1970, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the Order of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Petroleum & Chemicals and Mines and Metals (Department of Petroleum and Chemicals), No. S.O. 2857, dated the 14th August, 1970, published on pages 3819 of the Gazette of India, Part II-Section 3, Sub-section (ii), namely:—

In the said Order, for the entries:—

- “(i) The Deputy Drugs Controller, West Zone, Bombay.
- (ii) The Deputy Drugs Controller, East Zone, Calcutta.
- (iii) The Deputy Drugs Controller, North Zone, Ghaziabad.
- (iv) The Deputy Drugs Controller, South Zone, Madras.
- (v) The Drugs Inspectors, Bombay, Calcutta, Ghaziabad and Madras.”,

the following entries shall be substituted, namely:—

- “(i) The Deputy Drugs Controllers, India, at Bombay and Calcutta.
- (ii) The Assistant Drugs Controllers, India, at Ghaziabad and Madras.
- (iii) The Drugs Inspectors at Bombay, Calcutta, Ghaziabad and Madras.”.

[No. 17(48)/70-CH.III.]

R. J. BHOJWANI, Under Secy.

(पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० प्रा० 4023.—कानूनी आदेश औषधि (कीमत नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1970 के पैराग्राफ 22 और 23 के अनुरूप में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा, भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन और खान तथा धातु मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम तथा रसायन विभाग) के कानूनी आदेश संख्या 2857, तारीख 14 अगस्त, 1970 में, जिसका भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II, खंड 3, उप खण्ड (ii) के पृष्ठ संख्या 3819 पर प्रकाशन हुआ था; निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त आदेश में, इन प्रविष्टियों के लिए :—

- “(i) औषधि उप नियन्त्रक, पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, बम्बई।
- (ii) औषधि उप नियन्त्रक, पूर्वी क्षेत्र, कलकत्ता।
- (iii) औषधि उप नियन्त्रक, उत्तरी क्षेत्र गाजियाबाद।
- (iv) औषधि उप नियन्त्रक, पश्चिमी क्षेत्र, मद्रास।
- (v) औषधि निरीक्षक, बम्बई, कलकत्ता, गाजियाबाद और मद्रास।”

निम्न प्रविष्टियां प्रतिस्थापित की जायेंगी, अर्थात् :

- “(i) बम्बई और कलकत्ता में भारत के औषधि उप नियन्त्रक
- (ii) गाजियाबाद और मद्रास में भारत के औषधि सहायक नियन्त्रक
- (iii) औषधि निरीक्षक, बम्बई कलकत्ता, गाजियाबाद और मद्रास।”

[संख्या 17(48)/70-केमी III]

आर० जे० भोजवानी, अवसर सचिव।”

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

PUBLIC NOTICE

New Delhi, the 19th December 1970

S.O. 4024.—The following modifications which the Central Government proposes to make to the Master Plan for Delhi are hereby published for public information. Any person having any objection or suggestion with respect to the proposed modifications may send his objection or suggestion in writing to the Secretary, Delhi Development Authority, Delhi Vikas Bhawan, New Delhi, within a period of thirty days from the date of this notice. The person making the objection or suggestion should also give his name and address.

Modifications

- (1) An area measuring about 14 acres (5.07 hacts.) earmarked as Government offices in the Master Plan of Delhi, surrounded by (210' wide) Ring Road in the North, Safdarjang Hospital in the East, Master Plan Green in the South and land earmarked for Government offices in the West, is proposed to be changed for “public and semi-public facilities (Hospital)”.
- (2) An area measuring about 29 acres (11.7 hacts), earmarked as “Recreational” (Distt. park, play grounds and open spaces) in the Master Plan of Delhi, surrounded by Industrial area in the North, National

Highway No. 2 in the East, Master Plan 'green' in the South and the railway land in the West, located near Badarpur village falling in zone F-19, is proposed to be changed to 'Industrial' use.

2. The plans indicating the proposed modifications will be available for inspection at the office of the Authority, Delhi Vikas Bhawan, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi, on all working days except Saturday, within the period referred to above.

[No. F. 3(245)/68-MP.]

J. O. G. RUSSELL, Addl. Secy.

दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण

सार्वजनिक सूचना

नई दिल्ली 19 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4024:—केन्द्रीय सरकार दिल्ली मास्टर प्लान में नीचे लिखे संशोधन करने का विचार कर रही है, उन्हें जनता की जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित किया जा रहा है। इन संशोधनों के संबंध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को आपत्ति या सुझाव देना हो तो वे अपने आपत्ति और सुझाव इस जापन के 30 दिन के भीतर दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के सचिव, दिल्ली विकास भवन नई दिल्ली के पास लिख कर भेज सकते हैं। जो व्यक्ति अपनी आपत्ति या सुझाव दे वे अपना नाम तथा पूरा पता भी दें।

संशोधन

(1) लगभग 14 एकड़ का क्षेत्र (5.67 हेक्टर) मास्टर प्लान में सरकारी कार्यालयों के लिये रखा गया है। उसके उत्तर में रिंग रोड (210/चौड़ी) पूर्व में सफदर जंग अस्पताल, दक्षिण में मास्टर प्लान ग्रीन और पश्चिम में सरकारी कार्यालय के भवनों के लिए नियत स्थान हैं, जिसे पब्लिक एण्ड सेमी-पब्लिक सुविधायें (अस्पताल) के रूप में परिवर्तन करने का प्रस्ताव है।

(2) लगभग 29 एकड़ का क्षेत्र (11.7 हेक्टर) दिल्ली मास्टर प्लान के अनुसार रिक्वि-
येशनल" (डिस्ट्रिक्ट पार्क, प्ले ग्राउण्ड एण्ड प्रोपन स्पेस), इसके उत्तर में उद्योग भवन तथा पूर्व में
नेशनल हाईवे सं० 2, मास्टर प्लान के अनुसार दक्षिण में 'ग्रीन' है और पश्चिम में रेलवे नड है। यह
बदरपुर ग्राम के निकट है जो जोन एफ-19 के अन्दर पड़ता है। इस क्षेत्र को अब "इन्डस्ट्रियल"
यूज में परिवर्तन करने का प्रस्ताव है।

2. शनिवार को छोड़कर और किसी भी कार्यशील दिन में दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के कार्यालय, विकास भवन, इन्द्रप्रस्था इस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-1 में उक्त अवधि में आकर संशोधन के मान चित्रों का निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

[सं० एफ० 3 (245)/68-एम० पी०.]

जे० ओ० जी० रसिल, अधर सचिव।

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

New Delhi, the 12th November 1970

S.O. 4025.—In pursuance of clause (c) of section 2 of the Terminal Tax on Railway Passengers Act, 1956 (69 of 1956), the Central Government hereby declares "Jhusi" to be a notified place for the purposes of the said Act and directs

that the following amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) No. F(X)II-57/TX-19/12-1, dated 18th July 1961, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification, after item 9 and the entry relating thereto, the following item and entry shall be added, namely:—

“10. Jhusi.”

2. This notification shall come into force on the 1st January, 1971.

[No. F. (X)I-70/TX-19/14]

C. S. PARAMESWARAN, Secy.

रेल मंत्रालय
(रेलवे बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली 12 नवम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4025.—रेल यात्रियों पर सीमा के अधिनियम 1956 की धारा 2 के खण्ड (ग) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा इस अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए “झूसी” को अधिसूचित स्थान घोषित करती है और निदेश करती है कि भारत सरकार के रेल मंत्रालय (रेलवे बोर्ड) की अधिसूचना सं० एफ (एक्स) 11-57/टी एक्स 19/12-1 दिनांक 18-7-1961 में लिखित संशोधन किया जायगा, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में मद 9 और उसके सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टि के बाद निम्नलिखित मद और प्रविष्टि जोड़ी जायगी, अर्थात् :—

“10. झूसी”

2. यह अधिसूचना 1 जनवरी 1971 से लागू होगी।

[सं० एफ (एक्स) 70/टी एक्स-19/14]

सी० एस० परमेश्वरन, सचिव।

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 25th November 1970

S.O. 4026.—In pursuance of the resolution of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. 1/29/58-FP, dated the 5th February, 1959, as amended from time to time the Central Government has nominated Brig. R. Sreenivasan, Chairman, Central Board of Film Censors as the Chairman of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay with immediate effect vice Shri M. V. Desai.

[No. 28/3/70-FP.]

VIRENDRA D. VYAS, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION

(Department of Cooperation)

New Delhi, the 28th November 1970

S.O. 4027.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5B of the Multi-Unit Cooperative Societies Act, 1942 (6 of 1942) and in supersession of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Cooperation) Notification No. 7-4/68-Credit dated the 27th November, 1969, the

Central Government hereby directs that all the powers or authority exercisable by the Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies under the said Act shall also be exercisable by Shri S. M. Kurary, Divisional Joint Registrar of Cooperative Societies, Bombay Division, Bombay in respect of multi-unit cooperative societies registered in the State of Maharashtra.

[No. 7-4/68-Coord.]

S. SATYABHAMA, Dy. Secy.

खाद्य, कृषि, सामुदायिक विकास और सहकारिता मंत्रालय

(सहकारिता विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 नवम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4027.—बहु इकाई सहकारी सोसाइटी अधिनियम, 1942 (1942 का 6) की धारा 5 ख द्वारा प्रवक्ष्य शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और खाद्य, कृषि सामुदायिक विकास और सहकारिता मंत्रालय (सहकारिता विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० 7-4/68-क्रेडिट, तारीख 27-11-1969 को अधिष्ठांत करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निदेश देती है कि उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन सहकारिता सोसाइटी के केन्द्रीय रजिस्ट्रार द्वारा प्रयोक्तव्य सभी शक्तियों या प्राधिकार श्री एस० एम० कुरारे, मण्डल संयुक्त रजिस्ट्रार, सहकारी सोसाइटी बम्बई मण्डल के द्वारा भी बहु इकाई सहकारी सोसाइटी के, जो महाराष्ट्र राज्य में वास्तव में रजिस्ट्रीकृत है, सम्बन्ध में प्रयोक्तव्य होंगे।

[सं० 7-4/68-क्रेडिट]

एन० सत्यभामा, उप सचिव।

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

MERCHANT SHIPPING

New Delhi, the 5th October, 1970

S.O. 4028.—In pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (1) of Section 283 of the Merchant Shipping, 1958 (44 of 1958), the Central Government hereby declares that the Government of the Republic of Zambia have accepted the Safety Convention as defined in clause (37) of section 3 of the said Act, that is to say, the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea signed in London on the seventeenth day of June, Nineteen Hundred and Sixty, as amended from time to time.

[No. F. 46-MA(1)/70.]

पोतपरिवहन तथा परिवहन मंत्रालय

(परिवहन पक्ष)

व्यापारिक पोतपरिवहन)

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 1970

का० आ० 4028.—व्यापारिक पोतपरिवहन अधिनियम 1958 (1958 का 44) की धारा 283 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ए) का अनुसरण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि जाम्बिया गणतंत्र सरकार ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के खंड (37) में यथापरिभाषित सुरक्षा करार को अर्थात् लन्दन में जून उन्नीस सौ साठ के सत्रहवें दिन हस्ताक्षरित समुद्र में जीवन सुरक्षा करार समय समय पर संशोधित, को स्वीकार कर लिया है।

[सं० का० 46-एम०ए० (1)/70]

New Delhi, the 4th December 1970

S.O. 4029.—In pursuance of rule 5 of the Indian Merchant Shipping (Seamen's Employment Office, Calcutta) Rules, 1954, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Naresh Ch. Bharadwaj as a member of the Seamen's Employment Board (Foreign-going) at the port of Calcutta to represent the seafarers *vice* Shri Asit Mitra, and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) S.O. No. 2027 dated the 28th May, 1970:—

In the said notification, in Serial No. 13 for the entry 'Shri Asit Mitra', the entry "Shri Naresh Ch. Bharadwaj" shall be substituted.

[No. 15-MT(2)/69.]

नई दिल्ली 4 दिसम्बर, 1970

क्र० प्र० सं० 4029.—भारतीय व्यापार पोत (नाविक रोजगार कार्यालय, कलकत्ता) नियम 1954 के नियम 5 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री अरिस्त मित्र के स्थान में श्री नरेश च० भारद्वाज को नाविकों के प्रतिनिधि के रूप में बलवत् पत्र पर नाविक रोजगार बोर्ड (विदेशगामी) का प्रतिनिधि नियुक्त करती है और भारत सरकार, पोतपाँटहन तथा पाँटहन मन्त्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना क्र० प्र० सं० 2027, दिनांक 28 मई, 1970 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में क्रम सं० 13 में प्रविष्टि "श्री अरिस्त मित्र" के स्थान में प्रविष्टि "श्री नरेश च० भारद्वाज" रखा जायेगा।

[सं० 15-एम०डी० (2)/69]

New Delhi, the 11th December 1970

S.O. 4030.—In pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (1) of Section 283 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958), the Central Government hereby declares that the Governments of the countries mentioned in the Annexure to this notification have accepted the International Convention on Load Lines signed in London on the 5th day of April, 1966, as amended from time to time.

ANNEXURE

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF LOAD LINES, 1966.

Name of the Governments.

1. Australia.
2. Belgium.
3. Brazil.
4. Bulgaria.
5. Canada.
6. Congo, Democratic Republic of
7. China, Republic of.
8. Cuba.
9. Cyprus.
10. Czechoslovakia.
11. Denmark.
12. Finland.
13. France.
14. Germany, Federation Republic of.
15. Ghana.
16. Greece.
17. Iceland.
18. India.
19. Ireland.
20. Israel.
21. Italy.
22. Japan.
23. Korea, Republic of.
24. Kuwait.
25. Lebanon.
26. Liberia.

27. Malagasy Republic.
28. Maldives.
29. Mauritania.
30. Monaco.
31. Morocco.
32. Mexico.
33. Netherlands, Surinam and Netherlands Antilles.
34. New Zealand.
35. Nigeria.
36. Norway.
37. Pakistan.
38. Philippines.
39. Peru.
40. Poland.
41. Portugal.
42. Somalia.
43. South Africa.
44. Spain.
45. Sweden.
46. Southern Yemen.
47. Switzerland.
48. Trinidad and Tobago.
49. Tunisia.
50. Turkey.
51. United Arab Republic
52. United Kingdom.
53. United States of America.
54. Viet-Nam.
55. Yugoslavia.
56. Zambia.
57. Panama (Signature)
58. Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (Signature)

[No. F.42MA(1)/70.]

P. L. GUPTA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० प्र० 4030 —व्यापारिक पोत परिग्रहण अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 44) की धारा 283 की उपधारा (1) के बड (क) के अनुसरण से केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा यह घोषणा करती है कि इन अधिसूचना के अनुबंध में दिये गये देशों ने लन्दन में 5 अप्रैल, 1966 को हस्ताक्षरित अंतर्राष्ट्रीय भार-रेखा अभिसमय, समय समय पर यथा संशोधित को स्वीकार कर लिया है।

अनुबंध

अंतर्राष्ट्रीय भारसीमा अभिसमय, 1966

सरकारों के नाम

1. आस्ट्रेलिया
2. बेलजियम
3. ब्राजील
4. बर्मा
5. कनाडा
6. कंगो, लोकतन्त्रात्मक गणराज्य
7. चीन गणराज्य
8. क्यूबा
9. साईप्रस
10. चेकोस्लोवाकिया

11. डेनमार्क
12. फिनलैंड
13. फ्रान्स
14. जर्मनी, संघीय गणराज्य
15. घाना
16. ग्रीस
17. आइसलैंड
18. इंडिया
19. आइरलैंड
20. ईजराइल
21. इटली
22. जापान
23. कोरिया गणराज्य
24. क्यूबेट
25. लैबानान
26. लाइबेरिया
27. मालागासी गणराज्य
28. मालदीवस
29. मारोटीनिया
30. मोनाको
31. मोरोक्को
32. मेक्सिको
33. नेदरलैंड्स, सुरीनाम और नेदरलेन्ड्स आन्टीलस
34. न्यूजीलैंड
35. नाइजेरिया
36. नार्वे
37. पकिस्तान
38. फिनीशियाइन्स
39. पेरू
40. पोलैंड
41. पुर्तगाल
42. सोमालिया
43. साउथ अफ्रीका
44. स्पेन
45. स्वेडिन
46. सदरुन येमेन
47. स्विटजरलैंड
48. त्रिनिदाद और तोबागो
49. तुनीसिया
50. टर्की
51. संयुक्त अरब गणराज्य

52. युनाईटेड किंगडम
53. संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका
54. चीन-नाम
55. यूगोस्लाविया
56. जाम्बिया
57. पनामा (हस्ताक्षर)
58. सोवियत समाजवादी गणराज्य संघ (हस्ताक्षर)

[सं० एफ०-एम ए(1)/70]

प्यारे लाल गुप्त, अवर सचिव ।

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 16th December 1970

S.O. 4031.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 44 of the Road Transport Corporations Act, 1950 (64 of 1950), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Tripura Road Transport Corporation Rules, 1967, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Tripura Road Transport Corporation (Second Amendment) Rules, 1970.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. For sub-rule (1) of rule 3, the following shall be substituted:—

“The Corporation shall consist of six members including the Chairman out of which four shall be nominated by the Administrator as his representatives and two will be nominated by the Central Government in the Ministry of Railways as their representatives.”

[No. 43-TAG(1)/70.]

K. C. JOSHI, Dy. Secy.

(परिवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर, 1970

क्र० आ० 4031.—सड़क परिवहन निगम अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 64) की धारा 44 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा त्रिपुरा सड़क परिवहन निगम नियम 1967 में और आगे संशोधन करने के लिये निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है अर्थात् :—

1. (1) ये नियम त्रिपुरा सड़क परिवहन निगम (द्वितीय संशोधन) नियम, 1970 कहे जा सकेंगे ।

(2) ये शासकीय राजपत्र में अपने प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे ।

2. नियम 3 के उपनियम (1) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा:—

“निगम में अध्यक्ष को सम्मिलित करके छः सदस्य होंगे जिनमें से सारे प्रशासक द्वारा उसके प्रतिनिधियों के रूप में नाम निर्देशित किये जाएंगे और दो केन्द्रीय सरकार के रेल मंत्रालय द्वारा उनके प्रतिनिधि के रूप में नाम निर्देशित किये जाएंगे ।”

[सं 43-टी० ए० जी (1)/70]

के० सी० जोशी, उप सचिव ।

MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 5th December 1970

S.O. 4032.—Whereas on the 5th December, 1970, a Dakota aircraft VT-CZC belonging to Jamair Company while engaged in a non-scheduled passenger flight, crashed beyond INA Colony, soon after taking off from Safdarjung aerodrome resulting in the death of three members of the crew and one passenger and injuries to others and extensive damage to the aircraft;

And whereas, it appears necessary to the Central Government that it is expedient to hold an inquiry into the said accident by a Committee of Inquiry;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by rule 74 of the Aircraft Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby appoints a Committee of Inquiry composed of the following persons to hold an inquiry into the said accident, namely:—

- (1) Shri R. N. Kathju, Retired Director General of Civil Aviation—Chairman.
- (2) Capt. D. K. Malaviya, Civil Aviation Department—Member.
- (3) Shri M. C. Khuller, Indian Airlines—Member.

[No. F. 7-A/51-70.]

S. N. KAUL, Dy. Secy.

पर्यटन तथा नागर विमान मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 6 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० प्रा० 4032.—क्योंकि जामयेर कम्पनी का डकोटा विमान वी०टी०-सी०.जेड सी० अननुसूचित उड़ान का परिचालन करता हुआ 5 दिसम्बर, 1970 को सफदरजंग विमानक्षेत्र से उड़ते क्षुब्ध बाद आई०एन०ए० कालोनी के पीछे ध्वंस हो गया जिसके परिणामस्वरूप विमान-बर्मिडल के तीन सदस्यो तथा एक यात्री की मृत्यु हो गयी, अन्य बर्हिंको को चोट आई और विमान को भारी क्षति पहुची ;

आर क्योंकि केन्द्रीय सरकार की दृष्टि में उक्त दुघटना की एक जांच समिति द्वारा जांच किया जाना आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है ;

इसलिए, अब, विमान नियम, 1937, के नियम 74 द्वारा दिये गये अधिकारो का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त दुघटना की जांच करने के लिए एतद्वारा एब जांच समिति निर्देश करते हैं जिसमें निम्नलिखित व्यक्ति सम्मिलित होंगे :—

- | | |
|---|---------|
| (1) श्री प्रार० एन० काटजू, सेवा निवृत्त नागर विमान के महानिदेशक | अध्यक्ष |
| (2) एड्विन डी० के० मालविया नागर विमान विभाग | सदस्य |
| (3) श्री एम० मो० कुल्लर, इंडियन एयरलाइन्स | सदस्य |

[सं० फा० 7-ए/51-70]

सुरेन्द्र नाथ कौल, उप सचिव ।

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE

New Delhi, the 27th November, 1970

S.O. 4033.—In pursuance of rule 8 of the Export of Inorganic Pigments (Inspection) Rules, 1966, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India, in the late Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 1110, dated the 25th March, 1967, the Central Government hereby appoints the persons mentioned in the column (2) of the Table given below as the panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules against the decision of the Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas mentioned in the corresponding entry in column (1) thereof:

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal, he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

THE TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies	Persons constituting the panel of experts to which appeal lies
(1)	(2)
I. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the states of Assam, Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal, Nagaland and the Union territories of Manipur, Tripura & Part B Tribal areas in the state of Assam and the Andaman & Nicobar Islands.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shri J. P. Narasim, Associated Pigments Ltd., 14, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1. <i>Chairman</i> 2. Shri A. R. Kajeria, Pigments & Chemical Industries Pvt. Ltd., 32, Armenian Street, Calcutta-1. 3. Dr. P. K. Bhandari, Asstt. Works Manager, Shalimar Paints Ltd., H.O. Botanic Garden, Howrah-3. 4. Deputy Director (Chemicals), National Test House, 11/1, Judges Court Road, Alipore, Calcutta-27. 5. Prof. N. K. Bose, Professor of Chemical Engineering, University of Calcutta, Calcutta-9. 6. Deputy Director (Chemicals), Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, 14/1B, Ezra Street (7th floor), Calcutta-1. <i>Convener</i>
II. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the states of Maharashtra, Gujarat, and the Union territories of Dadra, Nagar Haveli and Goa, Daman & Diu.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shri P. C. N. Mazumdar, Kamani Metallic Oxides Pvt. Ltd., New Kamani Chambers, Nicol Road, Ballard Estate, Bombay-1. <i>Chairman</i> 2. Assistant Director (Chemicals), National Test House, Zakaria BDR Road, Bombay-15. 3. Prof. S. P. Potnis, Deptt. of Chemical Technology, University of Bombay, Matunga, Bombay-19. 4. Shri B. V. Dalal, Mercury Paints & Varnishes Ltd., Agar Bazar, Off V. S. Marg, Bombay-28. 5. Joint Director, Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, Regional Office, 11/21, Mathew Road, Bombay-4. <i>Convener</i>

(1)

(2)

III. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the states of Uttar Pradesh, M.P., Rajasthan, Punjab, Haryana and Jammu & Kashmir and the Union territories of Delhi, Chandigarh & Himachal Pradesh.

1. Dr. V. Ramakrishna,
Head of the Deptt. of Chemistry,
Indian Institute of Technology,
Delhi. *Chairman*
2. Dr. M. S. Muthana,
Deputy Director,
Indian Institute of Technology,
P.O.I.I.T.,
Kanpur.
3. Dr. I. S. Gupta,
Professor of Chemical Technology,
Punjab University,
Chandigarh-14.
4. Dr. R. K. Sud,
Nagrath Paints Pvt. Ltd.,
46, Fazalgunj,
Kanpur.
5. Shri R. R. Purohit,
Jt. Director of Industries (Chemicals),
Government of Rajasthan,
Jaipur.
6. The Oil Technologist to the
Government of Uttar Pradesh,
Ex-officio H. B. Technological Institute,
Nawabgunj, Kanpur.
7. Deputy Director,
Ex-officio Export Inspection Council,
6B/9, Northern Extension Area,
Rajinder Nagar,
New Delhi-5. *Convener*

IV. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the states of Tamil Nadu, Mysore, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Pondichery.

1. Prof. P. B. Janardhan,
A. C. College Campus,
Madras University,
Madras-25. *Chairman*
2. Shri T. K. S. Mari,
Deputy General Manager,
Addisons Paints & Chemicals Ltd.,
Post Box No. 851,
Sembiam, Madras-11.
3. Shri B. Rama Murti,
Chief Projects Manager,
Travancore Titanium Products Ltd.,
Post Box No. 1,
Trivandrum-7 (Kerala).
4. Shri N. T. Iyengar,
Technical Adviser,
Ultramarine & Pigments Ltd.,
Ambattur, Madras-53.
5. Shri J. Balasubramanian,
Deputy Director (Chem.),
Small Industries Service Institute,
65/1, G. S. Road,
Madras-32.
6. Deputy Director, —Ex-officio
Export Inspection Agency, Madras,
'Sire Mansion',
123, Mount Road,
Madras-6. *Convener*

2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.

[No. 60(130)/Exp. Insp./65.]

M. K. B. BHATNAGAR,
Dy. Director (Export Promotion).

विदेश व्यापार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 27 नवम्बर, 1970

का०आ० 4033.—अकार्बनिक वर्णक निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 के नियम 8 के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1110, तारीख, 25 मार्च, 1967 को अधिकाृत करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में वर्णित व्यक्तियों को विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप में, उसके स्तम्भ (1) की तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि में वर्णित क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण निष्पादन करने वाले निरीक्षण अभिकरण के विनिश्चय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियम के अधीन अपीलों की सुनवाई के प्रयोजन के लिए, नियुक्त करती है।

परन्तु यदि उक्त पैनलों में से किसी का कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितबद्ध है तो वह उस अपील से संबंधित कार्यवाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।

सारणी

वह प्राधिकरण जिसके विनिश्चय के विरुद्ध अपील विशेषज्ञों का पैनल जिसको अपील की जाएगी
की जाए। पैनल गठित करने वाले व्यक्ति।

(1)

(2)

I. असम, बिहार, उड़ीसा, पश्चिमी बंगाल, नागालैण्ड राज्यों और मनीपुर, त्रिपुरा और असम राज्य में भाग ख जन जातीय क्षेत्र और अन्दमान, निकोबार द्वीप समूह संघ राज्य क्षेत्र में आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण निष्पादन करने वाले निरीक्षण अभिकरण।

1. श्री जे० पी० नारायण,
एसोसिएटेड पिगमेंट्स लि०,
14 नेताजी सुभाष रोड,
कलकत्ता-1। अध्यक्ष
2. श्री ए० आर० कजेरिया,
पिगमेंट्स और केमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, प्रा० लि०,
32, आर्मेनियन स्ट्रीट,
कलकत्ता-1।
3. डा० पी० के० भण्डारी,
सहायक संकर्म प्रबंधक,
शालीमार पेन्ट्स लि०,
एच०ओ० बोटानिक गार्डन,
हावड़ा-3।
4. उपनिदेशक (रसायन),
नेशनल टेस्ट हाउस,
17/1, जजेज कोर्ट रोड,
अलीपुर, कलकत्ता-27।
5. प्रो० एन० के० बोस,
प्रोफेसर, रासायनिक इंजीनियरी,
कलकत्ता विश्वविद्यालय,
कलकत्ता-9।

(1)

(2)

महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात राज्यों और दादरा, नागर हवेली और गोवा, दमण तथा दीव संघ राज्य क्षेत्र में आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण निष्पादन करने वाले निरीक्षण अभिकरण।

6. उप निदेशक (रसायन),
(पदेन),
निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्,
14/1 बी, एजरा स्ट्रीट (7^{वें} मंजिल),
कलकत्ता-1 संयोजक

1. श्री पी० सी० एन० मजमवार,
कमानी मेटालिक आक्सआईड्स प्रा० लि०,
न्यू कमानी चेम्बर्स,
निकोल रोड, बलार्ड इस्टेट,
मुम्बई-1। अध्यक्ष
2. सहायक निदेशक (रसायन),
नेशनल टेस्ट हाउस,
जकरिया, बी डी आर रोड,
मुम्बई-15।
3. प्रो० एस० पी० पोटनिस,
रसायन प्रोद्योगिकी विभाग,
मुम्बई विश्वविद्यालय,
माटंगा, मुम्बई-19।
4. श्री बी० वी० दलाल,
मर्करी पेन्टस एन्ड वार्निशज लि०,
अगर बाजार, आफ बी० एस० मार्ग,
मुम्बई-28।
5. संयुक्त निदेशक पदेन निर्यात निरीक्षण
परिषद्, प्रादेशिक कार्यालय,
11/21, मेथ्यू रोड, मुम्बई-4। संयोजक

III उत्तर प्रदेश, मध्य प्रदेश, राजस्थान, पंजाब, हरियाणा और जम्मू और काश्मीर राज्य और दिल्ली, चंडीगढ़ और हिमाचल प्रदेश संघ राज्य क्षेत्र में आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण निष्पादन करने वाले अभिकरण।

1. डा० बी० रामकृष्ण,
विभाग अध्यक्ष, रसायन शास्त्र,
इंडियन इंस्टीट्यूट आफ टेक्नोलॉजी,
दिल्ली। अध्यक्ष
2. डा० एम० एस० मुथाना,
उपनिदेशक,
इंडियन इंस्टीट्यूट आफ टेक्नोलॉजी,
डाकघर, आई०आई०टी०, कानपुर।

(1)

(2)

3. डा० आई० एस० गुप्ता,
प्रोफेसर—रासायनिक प्रौद्योगिक,
पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय,
चंडीगढ़-14
4. डा० आर० के० सूद,
नागरथ पेट्स प्रा० लि०,
46, फजलगंज,
कानपुर।
5. श्री आर० आर० पुरोहित,
संयुक्त निदेशक—उद्योग (रसायन)
राजस्थान सरकार, जयपुर।
6. उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार का तेल शिला-विज्ञानी—
पदेन, एच० बी०
प्रौद्योगिक संस्थान, नवावगंज,
कानपुर।
7. उप निदेशक, पदेन :
निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्
6 बी/9, नार्दन ए।स.टेंशन एरिया,
राजेन्द्रनगर,
नई दिल्ली-5

संयोजक

IV तमिलनाडु, मैसूर, आन्ध्र प्रदेश, केरल और
पाण्डिचेरी राज्य।

1. प्रो० पी० बी० जनार्दन
ए० सी० कालेज केम्पस,
मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय
मद्रास-25
2. टी० के० एस० मनी,
उपमहाप्रबंधक,
एजीसन्स पेट्स एन्ड केमिकल्स लि०
पो० बाक्स सं० 851,
सेम्बियम, मद्रास-11
3. श्री बी० राम मूर्ति,
मुख्य परियोजना प्रबंधक,
ट्रायनकोर टिटानियम प्रोडक्ट्स लि०,
पो० बाक्स सं० 1,
त्रिवेन्द्रम-7 (केरल)।

अध्यक्ष

(1)

(2)

4. श्री एन० टी० अयंगर,
तकनीकी सलाहकार,
अल्डामेरीन एण्ड पिगमेन्ट्स लि० ।

5. श्री ज० बालासुब्रमनियन,
उप-निदेशक (रसायन),
लघु उद्योग सेवा संस्थान,
65/1, जी० एस० टी० रोड,
मद्रास-32

6. उप-निदेशक—पदेन,
निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण
मद्रास, 'सायर मेसन'
123, माउन्ट रोड,
मद्रास-6

संयोजक

2. पैसल की गणपूर्ति होगी ।

[सं० 60 (130) एक्स० इन्स०/65]
एम्० के० वी० भटनागर,
उप-निदेशक (निर्यात प्रोत्तन)

New Delhi, the 7th December 1970

S.O. 4034.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) and consequent to the change of address of M/s. Pest Killer Corporation, recognised as the agency for fumigation of de-oiled rice bran prior to its export, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment to the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 3608, dated the 16th November, 1965, namely:—

In the said notification, for serial No. 7 and the entries relating thereto, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“7. Messrs. Pest Killer Corporation, 6, Ganesh Chandra Avenue, Calcutta-13”

[No. 60(3)/Exp.Insp./67.]

K. C. SEKHARAN,
Deputy Director (Export Promotion).

नई दिल्ली, 7 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4034.—निर्यात (गुण नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और मैसर्स पेस्ट किलर कॉर्पोरेशन लि. के निर्यात के चोकर को उसके निर्यात से पूर्व घूमन के लिए अभिकरण के रूप में मान्यता प्राप्त, के पने में परिवर्तन के परिणामस्वरूप केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

की अधिसूचना सं० का०ग्रा० 3608 तारीख 16 नवम्बर, 1965 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, क्रम सं० 7 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा अर्थात्:—

“7. मैसर्स पेट किलर कार्पोरेशन,
6, गणेश चन्द्र एवेन्यू,
कलकत्ता-13:”

[सं० 60(3)/मि०नि०/67.]

के० सी० शेखरन,

उप-निदेशक (निर्यात संवर्धन)

(Office of the Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta)

ORDER

Calcutta, the 12th June 1970

SUB.—Order Cancelling the Exchange Control purposes copy of Licence No. P/E/0168169/C/XX/31/C/29-30 dated 29th May, 1969 in connection with the issue of a duplicate copy of the same for Rs. 1000.

S.O. 4035.—M/s. Shaw Wallace & Co. Ltd., 4, Bankshall Street, Calcutta-1 were granted an import licence No. P/E/0168169/C/XX/31/C/29-30 dated 29th May, 1969 for Rs. 1000.

They have now applied for a duplicate of Exchange control purposes copy of the said licence on the ground that the original exchange control purposes copy of the above licence has been lost fully unutilised.

In support of the same the applicant has filed an affidavit to the effect that the original exchange control purposes copy of the above mentioned licence has been lost. I am satisfied that original exchange control purposes copy of the licence has been lost and I have directed that a duplicate copy of the said licence in question should be issued to the applicant. The original exchange control purposes copy of the above licence is cancelled.

[No. 8/EI-II.]

M. S. PURI,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports,
for Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

(संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय, कलकत्ता)

आदेश

कलकत्ता, 12 जून, 1970

विषय : लाइसेंस सं० पी० 1 ई० /0168169/सी/एक्स/31/सी/29-30, दिनांक 29-5-69 मूल्य 1,000 रुपये की मुद्रा नियंत्रण कार्य-प्रति को रद्द किया जाना और उसी की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी किए जाने के बारे में आदेश ।

का०ग्रा० 4035.—सर्वश्री शा वेल्लेस एण्ड कम्पनी लि०, 4, बैंकशॉल स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता 1 को 1,000 रुपये के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी०/ई०/0168169/सी/एक्स/31/मी/29-30, दिनांक 29-5-69 स्वीकृत किया गया था ।

अब उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा नियंत्रण कार्य प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिए आवेदन किया है, इसके लिए उन्होंने यह आकार दिया है कि मूल मुद्रा नियंत्रण कार्य प्रति बिना कोई उपयोग किए ही खो गई है ।

उसी के समर्थन में कि लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है, आवेदक ने एक शपथ-पत्र जमा किया है। मैं इस बात से सन्तुष्ट हूँ कि मूल मुद्रा नियंत्रण कार्य प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देता हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि आवेदक को जारी की जाए। उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा नियंत्रण कार्य-प्रति रद्द की जाती है।

[संख्या 8/ई० आई०-2.]

एम० एम० पुरी,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात,
वास्तु संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात,।

(Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Bombay)

ORDER

Bombay, the 26th June 1970

S.O. 4036.—Import Licences Nos. (1) P/EP/8014069/C/XX/23 & 24/S/B/23 & 24/80/1228 dated 5th September, 1966 of the value of Rs. 17,283 and (2) P/EP/8015372/C/XX/23 & 24/S/B/23 & 24/80/1681 dated 1st December, 1966 for the value of Rs. 24,928 for the import of S.S. Sheets were issued to M/s. Standard Industrial Works, 95, Tamba Kanta, Bombay-3 subject to the condition that all the material imported under the licences should be used in the licensee's own factory or factories and shall not be sold or otherwise transferred to any other party.

2. Thereafter, a Show Cause Notice No. SB/CON/65-3 dated 4th April 1970 was issued asking them to show cause within 15 days as to why the said licences in their favour should not be cancelled in terms of Clause 9, sub-clauses (a) & (cc) on the grounds that the said licences have been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation and that the same will not serve the purpose for which they had been granted.

3. The said Show Cause Notice has been returned by the Postal Authorities undelivered with the remark "Not found".

4. Having regard to what has been stated in the preceding paragraph, the undersigned is satisfied that the licences in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered in effective. Therefore, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under Clause 9 sub-clauses (a) (cc) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 hereby cancels the licences Nos. (1) P/EP/8014069/C/XX/23 & 24/S/B/23 & 24/80/1228 dated 5th September, 1966, for Rs. 17,283 and (2) P/EP/8015372/C/XX/23 & 24/S/B/23 & 24/80/1681 dated 1st December, 1966 for Rs. 24,928 issued in favour of M/s. Standard Industrial Works, 95 Tamba Kanta, Bombay-3.

[No. SB/CON/65-3.]

S. D. MARATHE,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports,
for Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports,

(संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय, बम्बई)

आदेश

बम्बई, 26 जून 1970

एस० ओ० 4036—महेश्वरी स्टैंडर्ड इन्डस्ट्रीयल वर्क्स 95, ताम्बा कान्टा, बम्बई-3 को एस० एम० शीट्स के आयात के लिए 17,283 रुपये के लिए (1) आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी०/ई० पी०/8014069 सी/एक्स एक्स/23 तथा 24/एम/बी/23 तथा 24/80/1228 दिनांक 5-9-66 तथा (2) 24928 रुपये मूल्य के लिए ई० पी०/8015372 सी/एक्स एक्स 23 तथा 24/एम बी/23 तथा 24/80/1681 दिनांक 1-12-66 इम्पोर्ट के अधीन स्वीकृत किए गये थे कि इन लाइसेंस के अन्तर्गत आयातित माल उनके खुद के कारखाने में प्रयोग किया जाना चाहिए और वह बेचा नहीं जाएगा अथवा अन्यथा रूप से किसी भी अन्य पार्टी को हस्तान्तरित नहीं किया जायगा।

2. तत्पश्चात् एक कारण बताओ नोटिस बिना बाटे ही एक प्रधिशायिं द्वारा नई पार. र. इस टिप्पणी के साथ वापस कर दिया गया है।

3. उक्त कारण बताओ नोटिस बिना बाटे ही एक प्रधिशायिं द्वारा नई पार. र. इस टिप्पणी के साथ वापस कर दिया गया है।

4. अगत पारा में जो बताया गया है उसे ध्यान में रखते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी इस से संतुष्ट है कि अपेक्षित लाइसेंस रद्द किया जाना चाहिए अथवा अन्यथा रूप से अप्रभावित किया जाना चाहिए इस लिए अधोहस्ताक्षरी आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (ए) तथा (सी सी) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए सर्वश्री स्टैंडर्ड इन्डस्ट्रियल वर्कर्स, 95 नाम्बा काटा बम्बई-3 के नाम में जारी किए गए लाइसेंस सं० (1) पीई० पी/8014069/सी/एक्स एक्स/23 तथा 24/एस/बी/23 तथा 24/80/1228 दिनांक 5-9-66 मूल्य 17,283 रुपये तथा (2) पी/ई पी/8015372/सी एक्स एक्स/23 तथा 23/एस/बी/24 तथा 24/80/1681 दिनांक 1-12-66 मूल्य 24,928 रुपये को एतद्वारा रद्द करता है।

[संख्या एस बी/कान/65-3.]

एस० डी० मराथे,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात
कृते संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात

(Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, New Delhi)
(Central Licensing Area)

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 18th August 1970

S.O. 4037.—M/s. Singhal Engineering Industries, Mahrauli Road, Gurgaon were granted Import Licence No. P/SS/1609731/C/XX/25/CD/25/26 dated 6th February 1968 for Rs. 16,152 (Rs. Sixteen thousand, one hundred and fifty two only) for import of (1) Silicon Metal, (2) Ball Bearing 1 inch in bore (internal & below other than those specified in Appendix 14(i)(a), 14(i)(b) and 14(i)(c) and (3) Magnesium during A.M. 68 period against I.D.A. Chedit. They have applied for issue of duplicate copy of Customs Purposes Copy thereof on the ground that it has been lost/misplaced after having been registered with the Collector of Customs, Bombay and utilised to the extent of Rs. 1,991.

2. The applicant have filed an affidavit in support of their contention as required under para 313(2) of I.T.C. Hand Book of Rules and Procedure, 1970. I am satisfied that the original Custom Purposes Copy has been lost/misplaced.

3. In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9(CC) Import (Control) Order, 1955, dated 7th December, 1965, I order the cancellation of Custom Purposes Copy of Import Licence No. P/S/1609731 dated 6th February, 1968.

4. The applicant is now being issued a duplicate copy of the Customs Purposes Copy of this licence in accordance with the provision of para 302(4) of ITC Hand Book of Rules & Procedure, 1970.

[No. 8/PRIORITY/HAR/AM-68/AU-H.H./CLA/932.]

(संयुक्त मुख्य निर्यातक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली)

आदेशों

नई दिल्ली, 28 अगस्त, 1970

एस०ओ० 4037.—पत्राची सिंचन इंजीनियरिंग इन्स्टीट्यूट महारौली रोड, गुडगांव को अप्रैल-मार्च 1968 की अवधि के दौरान आई० डी०ए० श्रेण के अन्तर्गत 16,152 रुपये (सोलह हजार एक सौ बावन रुपये मात्र) का (1) सिलिकन मेटल (2) बेस में एक इंच वाले गोली लाम में (जो सूचक 14 (1) (ए), 14 (1) (बी) तथा 14 (1) (सी) में विशिष्टकृत से अन्य आन्तरिक तथा नीचे है तथा (3) मैग्नीजियम के आयात के लिए आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1609731/सीएक्स एक्स/25/सी डी 25/26 दिनांक 6-2-68 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति की अनूलिपि के लिए आवेदन किया है, इस के लिए उन्होंने यह आधार दिया है कि सीमा-शुल्क-समाहर्ता, बम्बई में पंजीकृत करने के बाद मूल प्रति खो गई है / गलत स्थान पर रख दी गई है, और उसका 1,991 रुपये तक का उपयोग कर लिया गया है।

2. आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा कार्यविधि हंडबुक 1970 की कंडिका 313(2) की भांगों के अनुसार आवेदक ने अपने तर्क के समर्थन में एक शपथ-पत्र जमा किया है। मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति खो गई है / गलत स्थान पर रख दी गई है।

3. आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की धारा 9 (सी सी) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग कर मैं आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1609731 दिनांक 6-2-68 की सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति रद्द करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

4. आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा कार्य विधि हंडबुक 1970 में दी गई व्यवस्थाओं के अनुसार आवेदक को उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क कार्य-सम्बन्धी प्रति की अनूलिपि जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या 8/प्राथमिकता/एच: ए: आर:/ए एम-68/एयू-एच: एच/सी. एल. ए:/932]

New Delhi, the 16th October, 1970

S.O. 4038.—M/s. Bharat Mechanical Works (Regd.), G. T. Road, Batala were granted the following import licences for the period April—March, 1970:—

- (i) P/S/1618817/R/GN/34/D/29-30 dated the 30th March, 1970 for Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand only) for import of Ball Bearings etc. under West German Credit.
- (ii) P/S/1618819/R/GN/34/D/29-30 dated the 30th March, 1970 for Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand only) for import of Ball Bearings etc. under West German Credit.
- (iii) P/S/1617284/R/IA/34/D/29-30 dated the 27th February, 1970 for Rs. 16,500/- (Sixteen thousand and Five hundred only) for import of Ball Bearings etc. under I. D. A. Credit.

They have applied for issue of duplicate copies of both Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copies of the above three licences on the ground that the original ones have been disfigured and have become illegible without having been registered with any customs authority. However, the Exchange Control Purposes copies thereof have been utilised by way of opening of Letters of Credit for the full value of the licences with Allahabad Bank Limited, Batala.

The applicants have filed affidavits in support of their contention as required under para 313(2) of the I. T. C. Hand Book of Rules and Procedure 1970. I am satisfied that both copies of the said three licences have been disfigured and have become illegible.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9(cc) of Import (Control) Order 1955, dated the 7th December, 1955 as amended up-to-date. I order the cancellation of the original customs purposes and Exchange purposes copies of the above said three licences.

The applicants are now being issued duplicate copies for customs purposes and Exchange Control purposes the copies of the above mentioned three licences in accordance with the provision of para 313(4) of I. T. C. Hand Book of Rules and Procedure, 1970.

[No. P/B-17/AM-70/AU-Pb./CLA.]

नई दिल्ली, 16 अक्तूबर, 1970

एस० प्रो० 3038.—सर्वश्री भारत मेकेनिकल वर्क्स (रजि०) जी० टी० रोड, बटाला को अप्रैल-मार्च 1970 अवधि के लिए निम्नलिखित आयात-लाइसेंस प्रदान किए गए थे :—

- (1) पश्चिमी जर्मन क्रेडिट के अन्तर्गत बाल बेयरिंग के आयात के लिए 10000/- रुपये (दस हजार रुपये मात्र) का आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1618817/आर/जी एन/34/डी/29-30 दिनांक 30-3-70।
- (2) पश्चिमी जर्मन क्रेडिट के अन्तर्गत बाल बेयरिंग इत्यादि के आयात के लिए 10,000 रुपये (दस हजार रुपये मात्र) का आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1618819/आर/जी एन/34/डी/29-30 दिनांक 30-3-70।
- (3) आई०डी०ए० क्रेडिट के अन्तर्गत बाल बेयरिंग के आयात के लिए 16,500/- रुपये (सोलह हजार पांच सौ रुपये मात्र) का आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/एस/1617284/आर/आई ए/ 34/डी/29-30 दिनांक 27-2-70।

उन्होंने उक्त तीनों लाइसेंसों की सीमा-शुल्क कार्य संबंधी तथा मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण, दोनों प्रतियों की अनूलिपि के लिए अनुरोध किया है, इस के लिए यह आधार दिया है कि मूल प्रतियां किसी सीमा-शुल्क प्राधिकारी से पंजीकृत नहीं कराई गई हैं और विहृत होने के कारण अपाठ्य हो गई हैं। किन्तु उक्त लाइसेंसों की मुद्रा-विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतियों के पूरे मूल्य का उपयोग इलाहाबाद बैंक लि०, बटाला में साखपत्रों के खोले जाने के कारण कर लिया गया है।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदकों ने आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा कार्यविधि हंड बुक 1970 की कंडिका 313(2) के अन्तर्गत मांगे गए के अनुसार शपथ-पत्र जमा किए हैं। मैं इस से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त तीनों लाइसेंस की दोनों प्रतियां विहृत और अपाठ्य हो गई हैं।

आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955, दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 (सी सी) के अन्तर्गत संशोधित शक्तियों का प्रयोग कर मैं उक्त तीनों लाइसेंसों की मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी तथा मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतियों को रद्द करने का निदेश देता हूँ।

आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा कार्यविधि हंड बुक, 1970 की कंडिका 313(4) के अन्तर्गत दी गई व्यवस्थाओं के अनुसार आवेदक को उक्त तीनों लाइसेंस की अनूलिपि सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी तथा मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतियों को जारी करने के मामले पर अब विचार किया जायेगा।

[संख्या पी०बी०-17/ए०एम०-70/एयू-पी० बी०/सी० एल० ए०]

New Delhi, the 3rd December 1970

S.O. 4039.—M/s. Supreme Radios and Service Company, 4848, Ansari Road, 24, Darya Ganj, Delhi were granted an import licence No. P/S/1611759 dated the 5th July, 1968 for the import of components for Amplifiers as per para 7 of Annexure to P. N. 68/67 dated the 16th November, 1967 wadding on General

Area for Rs. 26,000/- (Twenty six thousand only). They have applied for the issue of duplicate Customs purpose copy of the licence on the ground that Customs purposes copy of the licence has been misplaced after having been registered with New Delhi Custom House and partly utilised for Rs. 3,654/- only.

2. The applicant have filed an affidavit on stamped paper in support of their contention as required under para 299(2) read with Appendix 8 of the I. T. C. Hand Book of Rules and Procedure 1970. I am satisfied that the original customs purpose copy of the licence has been misplaced.

3. In exercise of the powers conferred on me under clause 9(cc) Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated the 7th December, 1955 as amended up-to-date, I order cancellation of Customs Purpose copy of licence No. P/S/1611759/C.XX.27. 30/D.25.28 dated the 5th July, 1968.

4. The applicants case will now be considered for issue of a duplicate Customs Copy of the said licence in accordance with para 313(1) and (2) of I. T. C. Hand Book of Rules and Procedure, 1970.

[No. F. 94/S/AM-68/AU. UT. CLA.]

A. L. BHALLA,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.
for Chief Controller of Imports and Exports,

नई दिल्ली, 3 दिसम्बर, 1970

एस० ओ० 4039.—सर्वश्री सुप्रीम रेडियो एंड सर्विसक० 4848, अन्सारी रोड, 24, दरिया गंज, दिल्ली को सार्वजनिक सूचना संख्या 68/67, दिनांक 16/11-67 के अन्वय की वडिका 7 के अनुसार सामान्य क्षेत्र से प्रवर्धक यंत्रों के लिए संघटकों के आयात के लिए 26000/- रुपये (छब्बीस हजार रुपये मात्र) का आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1611759, दिनांक 5-7-68 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की अतुल्य सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति जारी करने के लिए अनुरोध किया है, इसके लिए यह आधार दिया है कि उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति सीमा-शुल्क कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली से पंजीकृत कराए जाने और उसका 5654 रुपये का आंशिक उपयोग किए जाने के पश्चात् गलत स्थान पर रख दी गई है।

2. अपने नर्क क समर्थन में आवेदक ने आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा कार्यविधि हैड-बुक 1970 की परिशिष्ट 8 की कंडिका 299(2) के अन्तर्गत अपेक्षित शर्तों के अनुसार आवश्यक शपथ पत्र जमा किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति, गलत स्थान पर रख दी गई है।

3. आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की उपधारा 9 (सी सी) के अन्तर्गत अद्यतन संगोष्ठित प्रदत्त शर्तियों के प्रयोग वर में लाइसेंस संख्या पी/एस/1611759/सी/एक्स एक्स-27.30/डी०-25.26, दिनांक 5-7-68 की सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति को रद्द करने का निदेश देना हूँ।

4. आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा कार्यविधि हैड बुक 1970 की वडिका 313(1) तथा (2) के अनुसार आवेदक को उक्त लाइसेंस की अतुल्य सीमा-शुल्क कार्य सम्बन्धी प्रति जारी करने के मामले पर अग्र विचार किया जाएगा।

[नं० 94/एम/एस. 68/एयू०यूटी० सी.एस.ए.]

ए० एल० भल्ला,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात,
कृते संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात निर्यात।

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th November 1970

S.O. 4040.—M/s. Modern Farm Aid, B3/19, Ranapartap Bagh, Delhi, 7 were granted licence No. P/D/2178139, dated 25th February, 1970 from UK/India Maintenance Loan, 1969, for import of High Carbon Steel valued at Rs. 4,25,000. They have requested for the issue of duplicate copy of the licence on the ground that the original Exchange Control copy of the licence has been lost by them. It has been further reported by the licensee that the licence was lost after utilising Rs. 2,38,411. The licence has been registered with Collector of Customs, Bombay.

2. In support of their contention the applicant have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Exchange Control Copy of the licence No. P/D/2178139, dated 25th February, 1970, has been lost and directs that a duplicate Exchange Control of the said licence should be issued to them. The original Exchange Control Copy is cancelled.

[No. F. Tractor 10(1)/AM. 70/RM.L.]

G. D. BAHIL,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports,
for Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

(मुख्य निर्यातक आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 नवम्बर, 1970

एस० ओ० 4040.—सर्वश्री माइन फार्म एड, बी 3/19, राणा प्रताप बाग, दिल्ली-7 को यू०के०/भारत अनुदान अण 1969 से आई कार्बन स्पात के आयात के लिए 4,25,000 रुपये मूल्य का आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/डी/2178139 दिनांक 25-2-1970 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि मुद्रा-विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर अनुरोध किया है कि मूल-मुद्रा-विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति उन के द्वारा खो गई है। लाइसेंस-धारी द्वारा आगे यह बताया गया है कि 2,38,411 रुपये का प्रयोग करने के पश्चात लाइसेंस खो गया था। सीमा-शुल्क रमाहर्ता, बम्बई के पास लाइसेंस प्रज्वित किया गया है।

अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ-पत्र जमा किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी इससे संतुष्ट है कि लाइसेंस सं० पी/डी/2178139 दिनांक 25-2-1970 की मूल मुद्रा-विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देता है कि उन्हें उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि मुद्रा-विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। मूल मुद्रा-विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति रद्द की जाती है।

[सं० मिनिश सं० ट्रक्टर 10(1)/ए. एम. 70/आर. एम.-1]

जी० डी० बहल,

उप-मुख्य निर्यातक, आयात-निर्यात,

कृते मुख्य निर्यातक, आयात निर्यात।

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd December 1970

S.O. 4041.—Shri Swaran Singh Bains, S/O Labh Singh, V. & P.O. Dhamal, Teh. Garhshankar, Dist. Hoshiarpur, was granted a Customs Clearance Permit

No. P/J/2372579/N/MN/36/H/29-30, dated 6th August, 1970, for Rs. 11,500 for the import of One Zetor 2011 tractor (without batteries). He has applied for duplicate copy of the Customs Clearance Permit on the ground that the original Customs Clearance Permit has been misplaced. It is further stated that the original Customs Clearance Permit was not registered with any Custom House and not utilised. In support of his contention, he has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original Customs Clearance Permit No. P/J/2372579, dated 8th August, 1970, has been misplaced and direct that a duplicate Customs Clearance Permit should be issued to the applicant. The original Customs Clearance Permit is cancelled.

[No. 74-V/S-154/AM70/Adhoc/2218.]

J. SHANKAR,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

मध्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 दिसम्बर, 1970

एत० अ० 4041.—श्री स्वर्ण सिंह बन्स आत्मज लाभ सिंह, गांव तथा डा० धमाई, तहसील गढ़शंकर, जिला होशियारपुर के एक जैटर 2011 ट्रैक्टर (बिना बैटरियों के) आयात के लिए 11500 रुपये के मूल्य का एक सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट संख्या पी/जे/2372579/एन/एम एन/36/एच/29-30 दिनांक 6-8-1970 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट की अनुलिपि के लिए इन आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट अस्थानस्थ हो गया है। आगे यह उल्लेख किया जाता है कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट किसी सीमा-शुल्क कार्यालय से पंजीकृत नहीं हुआ था और न उसका उपयोग किया गया था। अपने तर्क की पुष्टि में आवेदक ने एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट सं० पी/जे/2372579, दिनांक 6-8-1970 अस्थानस्थ हो गया है और निदेश देता हूँ कि आवेदक को सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट की अनुलिपि जारी की जानी चाहिए। मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट रद्द किया जाता है।

[सं० 74-5/एस-154/ए.एम. 70/अध्व ५]

जे० शंकर,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात।

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

(Central Licensing Area)

CANCELLATION ORDER

New Delhi, the 15th September, 1970

S.O. 4042.—M/s. Nava Bharat Enterprises (Private) Limited, 4-1-1920, Tilak Road, Dinbad Estate, Hyderabad-1 were granted licence No. P/W/2614994/C/XX/34/D/29/30/handicraft, dated the 25th March, 1970 for Rs. 81,000/-. They have applied for the duplicate copy of Custom purpose copy and Exchange Control copy, of licence on the ground that the original custom purpose copy and Exchange control copy have been lost. It is further stated that the original licence was not registered and not utilized at all.

In support of this contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original custom purpose copy and exchange control copy of licence No. P/W/2614994 dated the 25th March, 1970 has been lost and directed that the duplicate licence (Custom purpose copy and Exchange control copy) should be

issued to the applicant. The original Custom purpose copy and the Exchange control copy of licence is cancelled.

[No. Exp-House-2/AM.70/SC.IV/CLA.]

D. S. MORKRIMA,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports,
for Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

संयुक्त-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात निर्यात का कार्यालय

(केन्द्रीय लाइसेंस क्षेत्र)

लाइसेंस रद्द करने का आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 1970

एस०ओ० 4042.—सर्वश्री नवभारत इन्टर-प्राइसेज (प्रा०) लि०, 4-1-920, तिलक रोड़ दिनवाद इस्टेट, हैदराबाद-1 को 81000 रुपये का लाइसेंस सं० पी/डब्लू/2614994 सी/एक्स एक्स/34 डी/29/30/हैन्डक्राफ्ट, दिनांक 25-3-70 जारी किया गया था। उन्होंने लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क प्रति तथा मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपियों के लिये इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि भूल प्रतियां उन से खो गई हैं। आगे यह उल्लेख किया गया है कि मूल लाइसेंस पंजीकृत नहीं कराया गया था और उस का उपयोग बिनाकुल नहीं हुआ था।

अपने तर्क की पुष्टि में आवेदक ने एक शपथ-पत्र जमा किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस सं० पी/डब्लू/2614994 दिनांक 25-3-70 की मूल सीमा-शुल्क प्रति तथा मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है और निदेश हुआ है कि लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि (सीमा-शुल्क प्रति तथा मुद्रा-विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति) आवेदक को जारी की जानी चाहिये। लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रति तथा मुद्रा-विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति को रद्द किया जाता है।

[संख्या एक्स-2-हाउस-2/ए० एम० 70/एस० सी 4 सी एल ए.]

डी० एस० मोरक्रिमा,

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात निर्यात.

कृते संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात।

MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 26th November 1970

S.O. 4043.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S. 2045 dated the 29th September, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri M. Chandrasekhar Aradhya to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Kerala for the purposes of the said Act and of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oil field or a controlled industry.

[No. 21(3)/68-PF.I.]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

अ १. रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक 26 नवम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4042.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का०आ० 2045 तारीख 29 सितम्बर, 1958 को अधि-क्रान्त करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद् द्वारा श्री एम० चन्द्रशेखर आराध्य को उक्त अधिनियम और उस के अधीन विरचित किसी स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में सम्पूर्ण केरल राज्य के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 21(3)/68/पी०एफ-1]

दलजीत सिंह, अवर सचिव।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 10th December 1970

S.O. 4044.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court No. 2, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs S. Kantilal and company private Limited, Curcholem-Sanvordem (Goa) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th December, 1970.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2,
BOMBAY

REFERENCE No. CGIT-2/3 OF 1970

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS S. KANTILAL
AND COMPANY PRIVATE LIMITED CURCHOREM-SANVORDEM

(GOA)

AND

Their workman Shri Dinanath Desai

PRESENT:

Shri N. K. Vanl.—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employer.—Shri G. V. Bhobe, Advocate.

For the Workman.—Shri George Vaz, General Secretary, Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union, Ansnora, (Goa).

INDUSTRY: Iron Ore Mines.**STATE:** Goa, Daman and Diu.

Bombay, the 17th November 1970

AWARD

By Order No. 24/75/69-LR-IV dated 9th January, 1970, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation, (Department of Labour and Employment) in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) referred

to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs S. Kantilal and Company Private Limited, Churchorem-Sanvordem (Goa) and their workman Shri Dinanath Desai in respect of the matter specified in the schedule mentioned below:—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs. S. Kantilal and Company Private Limited, Churchorem-Sanvordem (Goa) in dismissing the workman Shri Dinanath Desai, Foreman, Sirgal Mines with effect from 14th April, 1969 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The facts giving rise to this reference are as follows:—

3. Shri Dinanath Desai was employed in Messrs. S. Kantilal and Company Private Limited, Churchorem-Sanvordem (Goa) for the last 14 years. In the beginning he was serving as a Supervisor. Later on, he worked as a Foreman for 5 years.

4. On 24th March, 1969, the Manager of Sirgal Muddi Mine brought to the notice of the management, pilferage of explosives at the mine. On receipt of his report to the management, preliminary enquiry was ordered to be conducted by an officer of the company. After holding preliminary enquiry, he submitted his report holding Shri Dinanath Desai responsible for the pilferage of explosives at the mine.

5. On 26th March, 1969 show cause notice was issued to Shri Dinanath Desai. On the receipt of the explanation, Shri Dinanath Desai was suspended from service by another letter dated 29th March, 1969, pending enquiry, on charges levelled against him, as the explanation was not found satisfactory. Thereafter Shri Dinanath Desai was charge-sheeted and departmental enquiry was held against him. In that enquiry all the charges levelled against him were held proved. The management, therefore, dismissed him from service by letter dated 14th April, 1969.

6. As Shri Dinanath Desai was dismissed from service, he raised an industrial dispute under Section 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by his letter dated 17th May, 1969, stating that he was wrongfully dismissed by the management with effect from 14th April, 1969, without proper charge-sheet and proper enquiry, violating the principles of natural justice and that he be reinstated.

7. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-de-Gama issued notice to the management and after giving hearing, he could amicably settle the dispute. He therefore, submitted his failure of conciliation report to the Government.

8. On the receipt of this report, the Government of India referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

9. The employee Shri Dinanath Desai has filed written statement at Ex. 1/W in this case on 28th March, 1970, *vide* Schedule 'A' to the Award.

10. Messrs. S. Kantilal and Company Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as company) have filed written statement at Ex. 2/E on 8th May, 1970 (*vide* Schedule 'B' to the Award). The company has also filed counter-statement in reply to the statement of the workman at Ex. 3/E (*vide* Schedule 'C' to the Award).

11. From the pleadings and arguments advanced before me, the following points arise for decision in this reference.—

- (i) Whether the domestic enquiry held against the employee on 8th April, 1969 was proper and fair?
- (ii) Whether the same enquiry is vitiated?
- (iii) Whether the action of the management of Messrs. S. Kantilal and Company Private Limited, in dismissing the workman Shri Dinanath Desai, Foreman, Sirgal Mines with effect from 14th April, 1969 was justified?
- (iv) If not to what relief is the workman entitled?
- (v) What order?

12. My findings are as follows:—

- (i) No.
- (ii) Yes.
- (iii) No.

(iv) The workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and back wages with all benefits from the date of dismissal till the date of reinstatement.

(v) As per order.

Reasons

Point Nos. (i) and (ii):

13. Shri George Vaz for the workman contended that the domestic enquiry held against Shri Dinanath Desai on 8th April, 1969 was not proper and fair, that the principles of natural justice were violated in holding departmental enquiry, that the provisions of Certified Standing Orders applicable to the workman for holding departmental enquiry were not complied with and that the domestic enquiry in question was vitiated.

14. It is common ground that there are Certified Standing Orders applicable to the employees working in the company. These Standing Orders lay down provisions for holding domestic enquiry. It is therefore necessary to refer to the relevant provisions of the Certified Standing Orders applicable to the employee concerned.

15. Clause 21 of the Certified Standing Orders on record relates to disciplinary action for misconduct. Clause 21(b) relates to various punishments that can be awarded for misconduct. Clause 21(b)(5) relates to removal or dismissal from service. Clause 21(c) is as follows:—

"No order under sub-clauses (3), (4) and (5) of clause (b) shall be made unless the workman concerned has been informed in writing of the alleged misconduct or given an opportunity to explain the circumstances alleged against him."

16. Clause 21(d) of the Standing Orders is as follows:—

"No order of dismissal under sub-clause (5) of clause (b) shall be made except after holding an enquiry against the workman concerned in respect of alleged misconduct in the manner set forth in clause (e) below."

17. It is clear that before any employee can be dismissed by way of punishment for any alleged misconduct enquiry has to be held against him as mentioned in clause (e).

18. Clause 21(e) which lays down the procedure for holding domestic enquiry is as follows:—

"A workman against whom an enquiry has to be held shall be given a charge sheet clearly setting forth the circumstances appearing against him and requiring explanation and on date and time at which the case will be heard (which date shall not be less than seven days after the service of the notice). He shall be given an opportunity to answer the charge and permitted to be defended by a workman working in the same department as himself. Except for reasons to be recorded in writing by the officer holding the enquiry, the workman shall be permitted to produce witness in his defence and cross-examine any witnesses on whose evidence the charge rests. A concise summary of the evidence led on either side and the workman's plea shall be recorded."

19. Clause 21(g) of the Standing Orders is as follows:—

"In awarding punishment under this Standing Orders the Management shall take into account the gravity of the misconduct, the previous record, if any, of the workman and any other extenuating or aggravating circumstances that may exist."

20. In the present case the departmental (domestic) enquiry against the employee Shri Dinanath Desai was held by the Enquiry Officer Shri S. Radhakrishnaiah, Mining Engineer, examined at Ex. 19/E before me. The original enquiry papers have been produced before me at Ex. 12/E consisting 8 sheets including the report of Enquiry Officer. Shri Radhakrishnaiah proves the enquiry papers.

21. Shri Dinanath Desai Ex. 13/W contends that no charge-sheet was issued to him before holding enquiry. Shri Radhakrishnaiah, Enquiry Officer on the other hand says that Shri Dinanath Desai was charge-sheeted before holding enquiry, that he was informed to attend the enquiry and that he was aware of the

charges levelled against him. He also says in his evidence that letter dated 26th March, 1969 addressed to Shri Dinanath Desai is the charge-sheet against Shri Dinanath Desai.

22. Letter dated 26th March, 1969 has been produced by the employee at Ex. 5/W. It is as follows:—

"No. 23/3 March, 1969

Dated 26th March, 1969.

To

Shri Dinanath Desai,
Foreman,
Sirgal Mine.

You have been found responsible for the theft of explosives and detonators at Sirgal Mine and the cost of these shall have to be recovered from your salary.

Please explain why your services cannot be dismissed and legal action taken on you for your irresponsibility and misappropriation of the Company property and goods. Your reply should reach this office within 2 days of the date of this letter.

For S. Kantilal & Company Ltd.
Sd/-.

23. It appears from the company's written statement Ex. 2/E para. 2 that on 26th March, 1969, a show cause notice was issued to Shri Dinanath Desai charging him that he was found responsible for the theft of explosives at the mine and was asked to show cause as to why he should not be dismissed from the service.

24. There can be no doubt from para. 2 of Ex. 2/E and the letter dated 26th March, 1969 Ex. 5/W that the company intended to treat Ex. 5/W as show cause notice calling upon the employee to give his explanation.

25. A perusal of the letter Ex. 5/W shows that the management has already found the employee responsible for the theft of explosives and detonators at the Sirgal Mine and taken a decision to recover the cost of these articles from his salary. By this letter the management called upon the employee to explain as to why his services should not be terminated and legal action should not be taken for his irresponsibility and misappropriation of the company's property and goods.

26. As the management has already found the employee guilty i.e. responsible for the theft of explosives and detonators at Sirgal Mine where was the necessity for holding domestic enquiry on 8th April, 1969 treating Ex. 5/W as charge sheet. In these circumstances the domestic enquiry held against the employee in respect of the misconduct which the management has already held proved before holding the final enquiry, cannot be said to be fair and impartial. It is a prejudiced enquiry.

27. Findings at Ex. 12/E given by the Enquiry Officer Shri Radhakrishnaiah on 8th April 1969 show as follows:—

"In the light of periodical enquiries and opportunities given to Shri Dinanath Desai it has been proved that he was misappropriating company's goods, materials and money, and doing corrupt practices, intimidating the employees and creating anarchy in the organisation.

The said Shri Dinanath Desai was found guilty under the following provisions of the Standing Orders of the Company.

No. 21(a) (4, 5, 11, 12, 27, 28 and 38)".

28. As the Enquiry Officer has found Shri Dinanath Desai guilty under Clauses 21(a), 4, 5, 11, 12, 27, 28 and 38 of the Certified Standing Orders, it is necessary to refer to these various clauses. Those clauses are as follows:—

"21(a) the following acts and omissions on the part of a workman shall amount to misconduct:—

(4) Theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with the employer's business or property or a theft of another workman's property within the establishment.

(5) Demanding, accepting or offering bribes or any illegal gratification.

(11) Drunkenness, riotous, disorderly or indecent behaviour, use of abusive language, threatening, intimidating or coercing other workmen or wrongly interfering with the work of other workmen, assault or threat of assault either provoked or otherwise within the establishment.

- (12) Commission of any act subversive of good behaviour within the establishment or of the discipline of the establishment.
- (27) Refusal to accept a charge-sheet, order or other communication served in accordance with these Standing Orders or Company Administration Orders.
- (28) Knowingly and wrongfully interfering with the record of attendance or means of recording attendance of himself or any other workman.
- (38) Taking up or engaging in any work detrimental to the Company."

29. Turning back to the show cause notice dated 26th March, 1969 (Ex. 5/W) referred to above in detail it is clear from the said notice that it does not refer to various acts mentioned in clauses 21(a), 5, 11, 12, 27, 28 and 38 specifically, which acts according to the Standing Orders amount to misconduct. If Shri Dinanath Desai was to be charge-sheeted in respect of these acts mentioned above, it was absolutely necessary for the company to mention each act separately for bringing it to the notice of Shri Dinanath Desai. It should have called his explanation in respect of each act in respect of which the company wanted to hold domestic enquiry against him. Without specific charge in respect of each act, the Enquiry Officer is not justified in giving findings and allowing extraneous evidence. The Enquiry Officer has to hold enquiry in respect of specific charges framed against the workman concerned and not in respect of allegations which do not form part of the charge-sheet. If he holds enquiry in respect of extraneous matters, it is illegal, unfair and without jurisdiction.

30. In para. 2 of Ex. 2/E of the company's written statement, it is clearly mentioned that on 26th March, 1969 show cause notice was issued to Shri Dinanath Desai charging him that he was found responsible for the theft of explosives at the mine and was asked to show cause as to why he should not be dismissed from the service. It appears from this that the Enquiry Officer was called upon to hold enquiry in respect of charge regarding responsibility for the theft of explosives at the mines and not in respect of other matters in which he has given findings at Ex. 12/E i.e. clauses 21(a), 5, 11, 12, 27, 28 and 38. It is not understood as to how he thought of giving findings in respect of other matters, not finding place in the show cause notice which he wants to treat as charge-sheet.

31. Show cause notice Ex. 5/E which Shri Radhakrishnaiah wanted to treat as charge-sheet, makes no mention of any provisions of the Standing Orders. It does not mention any specific date on which the explosives and detonators were found missing at Sirgal Mine. It does not also mention the quantity of explosives and detonators in respect of which the theft is committed. It is thus clear that the alleged charge-sheet is vague and indefinite. On the basis of such charge-sheet it is not possible for the workman concerned to meet the case and defend himself properly. This amounts to depriving him of opportunity to defend himself properly.

32. It is clear from clause 21(e) of the Standing Orders referred to above that the workman against whom an enquiry has to be held shall be given a charge-sheet clearly setting forth the circumstances appearing against him and requiring explanation and on date and time at which the case will be heard (which date shall not be less than seven days after the service of the notice). A perusal of the show cause notice alleged to be charge-sheet produced at Ex. 5/W dated 26th March, 1969 shows that it has not clearly set forth the circumstances appearing against Shri Dinanath Desai requiring his explanation. It does not also mention the date on which the enquiry would be held. Thus it is clear that Ex. 5/W does not comply with the requirements of clause 21(e) of the Standing Orders.

33. There is another letter dated 7th April, 1969 produced at Ex. 18/W. It is as follows:—

"DE/4

Date 7th April, 1969.

To

Shri Dinanath Desai,
Foreman, Sirgal Mine (Under Suspension),

Dear Sir,

An enquiry will be instituted at 10.00 a.m. on 8th April, 1969 in this office on the charges levelled and proved against you for the pilferage of Explosives and Diesel.

You are hereby given an opportunity to defend yourself. You should attend to the enquiry with personal and documentary evidence/witness to defend yourself.

Yours faithfully,
For S. Kantilal and Company Limited.
Sd/-"

34. Admittedly the enquiry was held against Shri Dinanath Desai on 3th April, 1969. Notice requiring him to remain present for the enquiry is dated 7th April, 1969. It is clear that the employee did not get 7 days time after the service of the notice. It means that this notice also does not comply with the provisions of Clause 21(e) of the Standing Orders. This document also shows that the employee was to meet the charge of pilferage of Explosive and Diesel already held proved by the management. It means that the enquiry to be held against the workman was nominal because the charge was already held proved as mentioned at Ex. 18/W. It also shows that the only charge of pilferage was to be faced by the employee and not the charges under clauses 21(a), 4, 5, 11, 12, 27, 28, and 38 of the Standing Orders, but in spite of this the Enquiry Officer has given findings and found the employee guilty under clauses 21(a), 3, 11, 12, 27, 28 and 38. These circumstances also show as to what type of enquiry was held by the Enquiry Officer.

35. Evidence of Shri Radhakrishnaiah at Ex. 19/E shows that during the enquiry S/Shri Umameshwar Rao, Kandaswamy and Shivram Khandeparkar were examined on behalf of the management and that Shri Dinanath Desai gave his own statement and examined two witnesses on his behalf.

36. Shri Radhakrishnaiah Ex. 19/E says in his evidence that Shri Umameshwar Rao gave his own statement in Telugu, Shri Khandaswamy gave written statement in his own handwriting in English and Shri Shivram Khandeparkar gave written statement in his own handwriting in Marathi.

37. Shri Umameshwar Rao, Ex. 14/E in his evidence before me says that he gave written statement in Telugu before the Enquiry Officer and that the Enquiry Officer has not recorded his evidence.

38. From the evidence of Shri Umameshwar Rao before me and the evidence of the Enquiry Officer at Ex. 19/E I feel no hesitation in holding that the statement of S/Shri Umameshwar Rao, Khandaswamy and Shivram Khandeparkar were not recorded by the Enquiry Officer but he had accepted their written statements. In view of clause 21(e) of the Standing Orders referred to above it was necessary for the Enquiry Officer to take a concise summary of the evidence led on either side in the presence of the employee during the enquiry. By accepting the written statement he has violated the provisions of the Standing Orders.

39. As the written statement of the 3 witnesses referred to above were accepted by the Enquiry Officer during the Enquiry it was necessary for the Enquiry Officer to give copies of these statements to the employee concerned to enable him to study them and to prepare his defence atleast 2-3 days before holding enquiry. But this has not been done so in this case. More asking the employee to cross-examine the witnesses on the basis of such statement, even if it is explained to him during the enquiry would not be sufficient. In such circumstances it cannot be said that the principles of natural justice which require that person charged should have an adequate opportunity to defend himself, was observed.

40. In the ruling reported in 1963, II, LLJ, Page 371, in the case between Kesoram Cotton Mills Limited and Gangadhar and others their Lordships of Supreme Court of India have observed as follows:—

"It may accepted that rules of natural justice do not change from tribunal to tribunal. Even so the purpose of rules of natural justice is to safeguard the position of the person against whom an inquiry is being conducted so that he is able to meet the charge laid against him properly. Therefore, the nature of the inquiry and status of the person against whom the inquiry is being held will have some bearing on what should be the minimum requirements of the rules of natural justice. Where, for example, lawyers are permitted before a tribunal holding an inquiry and the party against whom the enquiry is being held is represented by a lawyer, it may be possible to say that a mere reading of the material to be used in the inquiry may sometimes be sufficient (See New Parkash Transport Company V. New Suvarna Transport Company Limited 1957 S. C. R. 98), but where in a domestic inquiry in an industrial matter lawyers are not permitted, something

more than a mere reading of statements to be used will have to be required in order to safeguard the interest of the industrial worker. Further the Court can take judicial notice of the fact that many industrial workers in India are illiterate and sometimes even the representatives of labour union may not be present to defend them. In such a case to read over a prepared statement in a few minutes and then ask the workmen to cross-examine would make a mockery of the opportunity that the rules of natural justice require that the workers should have to defend themselves. It seems therefore that where one is dealing with domestic inquiries in industrial matters, the proper course for the management is to examine the witnesses from the beginning to the end in the presence of the workmen at the enquiry itself. Oral examination always takes much longer time than mere reading of a prepared statement of the same length and brings home the evidence more clearly to the person against whom the inquiry is being held. It is quite possible to have another method of conducting a domestic enquiry as laid down in the decision in A. I. R. 1963 S. C. 375 but such should not be the rule but an exception only. Normally where the witnesses are not examined from the very beginning at the enquiry in the presence of the person charged, the person charged should be given a copy of the statements, and made by the witnesses which are to be used at the enquiry well in advance before the enquiry begins (say, two days before the enquiry is to begin). Where this is not done and the concerned workmen were asked to cross-examine the witnesses then and there, it could not be said that the principles of natural justice, which require that the person charged should have an adequate opportunity to defend himself, was observed.

41. Relying on this ruling and considering the facts of the case I am satisfied that the principles of natural justice have been violated during the enquiry held against Shri Dinanath Desai.

42. Shri Dinanath Desai Ex. 13/W says in the evidence regarding the enquiry held against him as follows:—

“No chargesheet was given to me before holding enquiry. The Labour Officer was the Enquiry Officer. His name is Shri Radhakrishnaiah. Two witnesses were examined on behalf of the company, they were S/Shri Shivram Kurdikar and Kandaswamy (night Supervisors). They were examined in my presence. They did not say anything against me. Shri Prakash Naik's statement was not recorded, but my statement was recorded by the Enquiry Officer. I had brought two witnesses for examining on my behalf. They are S/Shri R Sundaram and Phillip Dias. Both of them stated before the Enquiry Officer that Shri Francis Shovel Driver dashed tyre against the diesel drum with a result the drum was burst and the oil fell on the ground. No witness on behalf of the company stated before the enquiry officer that I had stolen diesel.

When the statement of Shri Umameshwar Rao was recorded by the Enquiry Officer, I was asked to stand outside the room. His statement was not read out to me at any time. Shri Shanker Desai was present at the time of enquiry but his statement was not recorded. Shri Laxmikant Navelkar was writing the statements of the witnesses but he has not given any statement against me.

Labour Officer conducted the enquiry in Hindi. I could not follow what he was telling in Hindi. I do not know English. My signature was taken on my statement without reading and explaining my statement to me. Shri Kandaswamy gave evidence during enquiry in Tamil. That statement was not translated to me in Konkani or in Hindi. I do not know whether Shri Shivram Kurdikar gave Marathi writing to the enquiry officer.”

43. The management has examined S/Shri Umameshwar Rao, Ex. 14/E, Laxmikant Navelkar, Ex. 17/E and Radhakrishnaiah Enquiry Officer Ex. 19/E to show that the domestic enquiry held against Shri Dinanath Desai on 8th April, 1969 was proper, fair and that no provision of the Standing Orders were violated and that the principles of natural justice were complied with.

44. If we consider the evidence of 3 witnesses examined on behalf of the company referred to above in the light of the facts and circumstances discussed above, the evidence of Shri Dinanath Desai deserves more weight in preference to the testimony of S/Shri Umameshwar Rao, Laxmikant Navekar and the enquiry officer Shri Radhakrishnaiah.

45. From the evidence of Shri Dinanath Desai referred to above it is his contention that the chargesheet was not served on him. The Enquiry Officer does not say whether before holding enquiry, after the service of show cause notice (Ex. 5/W) any chargesheet was sent to Shri Dinanath Desai. It therefore appears to me that specific chargesheet was not served on Shri Dinanath Desai before holding enquiry against him.

46. After the findings dated 8th April, 1969 Ex. 12/E were received by the management, the management accepted the findings and dismissed the employee by its letter dated 14th April, 1969 Ex. 7/W. This letter is as follows:—

"No. 14/4/69-76.
Mr. Dinanath Desai,
Quepem-Goa.

Date 14th April, 1969.

Dismissal Order

Further to this office letter No. 29/3/69 dated the 29th March, 1969 as the charges levelled against Mr. Dinanath Desai were proved, the management is constrained to dismiss his service in the company with immediate effect.

For S. Kantilal and Company Limited.
Sd/-"

47. Before awarding punishment of dismissal the management has to take into consideration the gravity of misconduct, the previous record if any of the workman and other extenuating or aggravating circumstances that may exist, as required under Clause 21(g) of the Standing Orders. In the present case the management has nowhere mentioned in its dismissal letter Ex. 7/W that it has taken into consideration the gravity of misconduct, the previous record of the workman and other extenuating or aggravating circumstances that may exist. It, therefore, appears to me that the management has not applied its mind and considered the enquiry papers properly before passing the dismissal order. The management has, therefore, not complied with the provisions of Clause 21(g) of the Standing Orders. This vitiates the enquiry proceedings.

48. In the case of Mahalakshmi Textile Mills *versus* Labour Court, Madurai and others, reported in 1963, II, LLJ, Page 58, their Lordships in the High Court of Judicature at Madras have held as follows:—

"The standing orders of an establishment *inter alia* constituted absence without leave for eight consecutive days a misconduct. It further provided that in awarding punishment to a workman found guilty of misconduct at a domestic enquiry the management shall take into account the gravity of misconduct, the previous record if any, of the workman and any other extenuating circumstances that may exist.

A workman who was found guilty of remaining absent without leave for more than eight consecutive days at the domestic enquiry was awarded the punishment of dismissal from service. The concerned workman did not participate in the domestic enquiry.

The Labour court adjudicating the dispute set aside the order of dismissal and directed his reinstatement.

The writ petition preferred by the employer to quash the resulting award was dismissed on ground that the management had failed to take into account the various factors before awarding punishment as required by the relevant provisions of the standing order (such as gravity of the misconduct, past record of the workman and the extenuating circumstances, if any). The award of the Labour Court was interpreted in substance and effect, as amounting to a conclusion or finding that relevant matters had not been taken into consideration by the management in awarding punishment."

49. The above ruling clearly supports my view that as the management has not complied with the provisions of clause 21 (g) of the Standing Orders before inflicting the punishment of dismissal on Shri Dinanath Desai, the enquiry proceedings are vitiated.

50. In short it is clear from the above discussions that in the present case, the domestic enquiry held against the employee on 8th April, 1969 was not proper and fair, that the management has violated the provisions of the Standing Orders in holding domestic enquiry, that the principles of natural justice were violated and that the enquiry is therefore vitiated. Hence my finding on Point Nos. (i) and (ii) are as above.

Point Nos. (iii) and (iv):

51. As the domestic enquiry held against Shri Dinanath Desai on 8th April, 1969 by the company was not fair and proper and as the same is vitiated, the company's case on evidence adduced before me against Shri Dinanath Desai has to be considered.

52. The Company has examined 3 witnesses before me, namely (1) Shri Umameshwar Rao, Ex. 14/E, (2) Shri Laxmikant Navelkar, Ex. 17/E and (3) Shri Radhakrishnaiah, Ex. 19/E.

53. As regards Shri Radhakrishnaiah, Ex. 19/E, he was the Enquiry Officer. He speaks about the enquiry. He has no knowledge about the allegations made against Shri Dinanath Desai.

54. As regards Shri Laxmikant Navelkar, Ex. 17/E, he was recording the statements of witnesses during the enquiry. He speaks as to what happened during the enquiry. He does not say anything about the allegations made against Shri Dinanath Desai by the company in respect of which the enquiry was held against Shri Dinanath Desai.

55. As regards Shri Umameshwar Rao, Ex. 14/E, he was posted to Sirgal Mine as Manager on 22nd March, 1969. According to him:—

(i) When he took charge as Manager at Sirgal Mine, Shri Dinanath Desai was in charge of the Mine.

(ii) The letter dated 28th February, 1969 is addressed to the Manager or in-charge of Sirgal Mine by the Head Office directing to lodge a complaint with the Police Station regarding the theft of 200 detonators. At the time of receipt of this letter at Sirgal Mine Shri Dinanath Desai was in charge. After he took over as Manager, he checked the explosives. On checking he found that some Jelotines and one detonator were missing. Actual stock in hand was not tallying with the stock. On taking over charge he found that the explosives were stored in a place different from the normal one. He therefore made a report to the General Manager. The report dated 24th March, 1969 shown to him bears his signature. It is correct.

56. The evidence of Shri Umameshwar Rao referred to above relates to 3 instances i.e. (1) Regarding the theft of 200 detonators in respect of which the complaint was given to the Police Station. (2) Regarding some Jelotines and one detonator found missing after he took over and checked the stock. (3) Explosives were stored in a place different from the normal one.

57. The employee Shri Dinanath Desai has given evidence before me at Ex. 13/W. According to him, there was theft of explosives in the Sirgal Mine Godown. Shri Prakash Naik informed him that two boxes of explosives were missing, because the Mines Manager was absent. Shri Prakash Naik wrote a letter to Sanvordem Office, about this under his signature. The General Manager Shri Manilal Gozalia wrote a letter to the Mines Manager or in-charge of the mine for filing a complaint regarding the incident of missing two boxes of explosives in Sanguem Police Station. As the Mines Manager was not present when this letter was received he went to the Police Station and lodged the complaint. On account of this complaint, one Havildar and a constable came to the Mine for making investigations. After taking a round they asked S/Shri Prakash Naik and Kandaswamy to whom they were suspecting. They gave the name of Shri M. Doralah as a suspect. Police took him to the Police Station. He was kept in Lock up.

58. There can be no doubt from the letter Ex. 16/E dated 28th February, 1969 that the Manager or Incharge, Sirgal Mine was directed to lodge a complaint with the Police Station immediately regarding the theft of 200 Detonators.

59. Shri George Vaz on behalf of the employee had written a letter Ex. 9/W dated 23rd February, 1970 to the Inspector General of Police, Police Headquarters, Panjim, Goa for giving necessary information regarding the complaint given by Shri Dinanath Desai in respect of theft of 200 detonators. The Supdt. of Police, Panaji gave reply to the General Secretary, Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union, Assonora-Bardez, Goa vide Ex. 10/W dated 17th March, 1970. That reply is as follows:—

“With reference to your above letters, I may inform you that it is a fact that Shri Dinanath Desai had lodged his complaint with Sanguem Police regarding theft of two boxes of detonators from the godown of M/s S. Kantilal and Company Private Limited in March, 1969. However, the Police did not succeed in detecting the same offence.”

60. It appears that Shri Doralah was later on released and that nothing turned up in respect of the complaint regarding the theft given by Shri Dinanath Desai.

61. The relevant portion from the counter statement dated 25th June, 1970 Ex. 3/E of the company in this case is as follows:—

“With reference to paras. 5, 6 and 7 of the statement of claim, it is stated that Shri Dinanath Desai is trying to confuse and confound facts in order to create confusion in the minds of this honourable tribunal. The facts cited in the said paras have nothing to do with the case against Shri Dinanath Desai. It is stated that after the matter of pilferage of explosives etc. had come to the notice of the management, the Sirgal Mine office was directed to lodge a complaint to the police. However, the charges made against Shri Dinanath Desai and his consequent dismissal are independent and based upon the enquiry report.

On 24th March, 1969 the management received a letter from the Manager of Sirgal Mine, who joined duty on 22nd March, 1969 stating that he found gelatine stored in some other quarters than the original place. He further stated that the stock in hand did not tally with the stock shown in the record book. The said letter is exhibited here. Further separately he made a detailed report complaining about the various irregularities and pilferage of explosives etc. at the mine.

The management, consequently, thought it admissible to look into the matters and investigate the same. The Mines Manager in his report made it clear that Shri Dinanath Desai was responsible for the pilferage of explosives and other irregularities. On this, the management ordered a preliminary enquiry to be conducted by an officer of the company, who after enquiry submitted his preliminary report charging Shri Dinanath Desai as responsible for the pilferage of explosives at the mine.”

62. If the management meant by the above mentioned counter-statement that Shri Dinanath Desai has no concern with incident regarding theft of 200 detonators in respect of which police complaint was given and that he is concerned in respect of shortage of explosives found by Shri Umameshwar Rao on his taking charge as Mines Manager at Sirgal on 24th March, 1969, the second incident referred to by Shri Umameshwar Rao will have to be only considered. If not both incidents will have to be considered.

63. According to Shri Dinanath Desai Ex. 13/W there is a tin shed near Sirgal Mine where explosives are stored. Shri Prakash Naik was in charge of issuing explosives. There is a Mines Manager at Sirgal Mines. His name was Shri Reddy. In the absence of Shri Reddy on leave another person by name Shri Umameshwar Rao was the Manager of the Mine. Mine Manager was in charge of safety regulations on the mines. Key of godown in which the explosives are stored remains with Shri Prakash Naik during the day and at night it remains with the Supervisor on duty. Names of night supervisors are S/Shri Shivram Kurdikar, Kandaswami and Suresh Moraskar. These Supervisors remain in charge of the explosive godowns during the night duty according to their turns.

64. From the above mentioned evidence of Shri Dinanath Desai, it is clear that the key of godown in which the explosives are stored remains with Shri Prakash Naik during the day and at night it remains with the Supervisors on duty.

65. In the present case Shri Prakash Naik has not been examined, before me. Similarly the Supervisors referred to by Shri Dinanath Desai have not been examined before me.

66. As against the statement of Shri Dinanath Desai that the key of the godown of explosives used to remain with these persons, there is no positive counter statement. Shri Umameshwar Rao Ex. 14/E in his cross-examination says that on enquiry he learned that clerk used to hand over the key to Shri Dinanath Desai every day. On his admission it is clear that he has no personal knowledge with whom the key of the godown of explosives used to be. Hence there is no reason to dis-believe the evidence of Shri Dinanath Desai, when he says that the key used to remain with Shri Prakash Naik during the day and at night with the night supervisors.

67. As the key was not in the possession of Shri Dinanath Desai he cannot be held responsible for the alleged theft of 200 detonators in respect of which there was police complaint. Moreover the company has not adduced any convincing evidence before me to prove the circumstances from which it can be inferred that Shri Dinanath Desai had concern with the theft of 200 detonators in respect of which there was Police complaint. Hence Shri Dinanath Desai cannot be held responsible on evidence and material before me in respect of theft of 200 Gelatine i.e. 2 boxes of explosives, alleged to have been stolen away in respect of which there was police complaint. I have considered this incident also because the allegations made by the company are not clear.

68. As regards the second incident there is a report of Shri Umameshwar Rao made to the head office on 24th March, 1969. It is as follows:—

"On Saturday (22nd March) I was reported to the mine and I found Gelatine was stored in some other quarters. Previously it was kept in the office room. It was brought to the office room and counted. There was 133 Nos. But the record is showing 228 Nos. From this it is noted 93 Nos. were missed.

It was noticed that one detonator also missed.

I don't know who changed explosives from office stores to that quarters and what happened to that 93 Nos. of Gelatine and one Detonator.

This is for your information and necessary action.

Thanking you, Sir."

69. From the report referred to above, it appears that Shri Umameshwar Rao had brought the explosives to the office room and counted them. On counting he found that 93 Gelatine and one Detonator were missing.

70. According to Shri Umameshwar Rao Ex. 14/E, Shri Kandaswamy is maintaining the accounts of Detonators and Gelatine. The office store is having lock and key. As Manager, he is not in charge of the key of the store. During the day-time Shri Prakash Naik remains in charge of the lock and key of the store (explosives). In the evening he used to hand over key to the Mine incharge. The other place where he found Gelatine and Detonators could be locked. This was the room in which 3 persons were living. They were S/Shri Bima Naik, Antony and Dinanath Desai. On enquiry with these 3 persons he learn that there was heavy blasting on the Mine on the day prior to 22nd March, 1969 and that on account of that Gelatines and Detonators that remained unused on that day on the mines were brought and stored in the residential room. Shri Bima Naik is working as compressor driver and Shri Antony is a Bulldozer cleaner and driver. Normally explosives are not issued to Compressor Drivers and Bulldozer drivers. There is a record in the office to show as to what quantity of explosives is issued to a particular person for blasting purposes, as to what quantity of explosives is returned as unused. He can produce this register in the Court.

71. On admission of Shri Umameshwar Rao that there is record in the office to show as to what quantity of explosive is issued to a particular person for blasting purposes and as to what quantity of explosive is returned as unused. Admittedly, there was heavy blasting on the day prior to 22nd March, 1969. The record has not been produced before me to show as to what quantity of explosive was issued and as what quantity of explosive was returned. In the absence of

any documentary evidence, mere oral statement of Shri Umameshwar Rao and his report to this effect cannot be given any weight.

72. Admittedly, Shri Prakash Naik used to remain incharge of lock and key of the store containing the explosives. It was absolutely necessary for the management to examine him. He would have been the best witness to say as to what had happened to the explosives. Similarly Shri Kandaswamy should have been examined before me. He was maintaining the accounts of explosives. As he has not been examined before me and as the account maintained by Shri Kandaswamy regarding explosives has not been produced before me, mere oral statement of Shri Umameshwar Rao and his report regarding shortage of explosives cannot be given any weight.

73. Shri Umameshwar Rao says in his evidence before me that Shri Prakash Naik used to hand over the key of the godown to Mine Incharge. Shri Dinanath Desai denies this on oath. He confirms that the supervisors used to remain in charge of the key at night. In the absence of evidence of supervisors S/Shri Shivram Kurdikar, Kandaswamy and Suresh Moraskar, no weight can be attached to the testimony of Shri Umameshwar Rao when he says that in the evening Shri Prakash Naik used to hand over the key to the Mine Incharge.

74. Shri Umameshwar Rao's evidence shows that after he took over charge as Mine Manager at Sirgal Mine on 22nd March, 1969 he found that explosives were stored in a room different from the place where they should have been stored and that this room was in the possession of 3 persons i.e. Shri Bima Naik, Shri Antony and Shri Dinanath Desai. S/Shri Bima Naik and Antony were not examined before me. If three persons were occupying a room in which explosives were found, it may be that any one of the three might have brought the article and kept there without the knowledge of the others. It cannot therefore be conclusively said that Shri Dinanath Desai was responsible for keeping these explosives in the room in which he is alleged to be living alongwith two others.

75. According to Shri Dinanath Desai, Ex. 13/W, on 22nd March, 1969, Shri Umameshwar Rao was posted as Mine Manager. At that time he was incharge at Sirgal Mine. He is not qualified for the post of foreman but he is qualified as Mine Mate. Foreman's duty mentioned in Ex. 4/W are usually given to other Foremen also. All persons working in the Mines used to work under him in the absence of Mines Manager. It is not true that explosives and other machinery at the mines were under his charge, but explosives were distributed by Shri Prakash Naik, Clerk. He does not know whether Shri Umameshwar Rao after taking charge as Mine Manager found that explosives were stored at a different place and not in the normal place. He does not know whether Shri Umameshwar Rao made a report to the Head Office stating that on checking explosives were found missing and that they were not tallying with the entries in the register. It is not true that explosives were in his custody or charge but he was supervising the labourers in the place where he was assigned work.

76. In short, considering the evidence of Shri Dinanath Desai Ex. 13/W and the company's witness Shri Umameshwar Rao's evidence on the point regarding the responsibility for the shortage of 93 numbers of Gelatine and One Detonator, I find that Shri Dinanath Desai cannot be held responsible for the shortage.

77. As regards the various allegations in respect of which Enquiry Officer found Shri Dinanath Desai guilty as mentioned in his finding Ex. 12/E, there is no evidence or material before me. Hence on merit I cannot hold Shri Dinanath Desai guilty for misconducts under clauses 21(a), 5, 11, 12, 27, 28 and 38.

78. In short I find that even on merit and material before me, Shri Dinanath Desai is not found guilty of any misconduct. Hence the action of the management of Messrs. S. Kantilal and Company Private Limited in dismissing the workman Shri Dinanath Desai, Foreman, Sirgal Mine with effect from 14th April, 1969 is not justified. He is therefore entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and back wages together with all benefits with effect from the date of dismissal till the date of reinstatement.

79. It appears that Shri Dinanath Desai was suspended by the management. As his dismissal has been set aside, he will be entitled to full wages and benefits for the period of suspension. Hence my finding on Point Nos. (iii) and (iv) are as above.

Point No. (v):

80. In view of the above findings, I pass the following order:—

ORDER

- (i) It is hereby declared that the action of the management of Messrs. S. Kantilal and Company Private Limited in dismissing the workman Shri Dinanath Desai, Foreman, Sirgal Mine with effect from 14th April, 1969 is not justified, and that he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service with back wages together with all benefits from the date of dismissal till the date of reinstatement.
- (ii) The company is directed to reinstate Shri Dinanath Desai with immediate effect and to give him continuity of service and back wages and other benefits till the date of reinstatement.
- (iii) Award is made accordingly.
- (iv) No order as to costs.

(Sd.) N. K. VANI,

Presiding Officer,

Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay.

SCHEDULE 'A'

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2
AT BOMBAY**

REFERENCE No. CGIT-2/3 OF 1970

Employers in relation to M/s S. Kantilal and Co. Pvt. Ltd.

AND

Their Workman—Shri Dinanath Desai

In the matter of the Dismissal from service of Shri Dinanath Desai, Foreman, Sirgal Mines.

Statement of Claim filed by the Workman.

The Government of India by its Order of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation No. 24/75/69-LR-IV dated 9th January, 1970, in pursuance of powers conferred upon it under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) has been pleased to refer the above dispute to this Honourable Tribunal. The subject matter of the dispute is as follows:—

SCHEDULE

Whether the Action of the Management of Messrs S. Kantilal and Company Private Limited, Curchorem (Savordem) Goa in dismissing the workman Shri Dinanath Desai, Foreman, Sirgal Mines with effect from 14th April 1969 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled.

2. Messrs Kantilal and Company Pvt. Ltd. are Mine owners with their Head Office at Margao, Goa and carrying on mining activities at Villiena, Modlo Tuor, Khute Temb, Barazan, Neturli, Sakorda, Nanora and other mines. It is one of the leading Mining Firms in Goa and was established from 1948/49.

3. I was appointed in the capacity of a Supervisor on the mines from the year 1955 and have worked in most of the mines of the Company during my service of 14 years. I qualified myself as a Mines Mate and was designated as a Foreman some two years back. My duties as a Mines Foreman were assigned to me by Mr. Manilal S. Gosalia who was overall Manager looking after the mining operations of the Company. As Foreman I was assigned duties periodically and on the 25th March 1969 I was given a Memo of Duties of Foreman which read—

1. He will be responsible for quarry No. 1 to arrange for removal of the overburden and formation of benches.

2. He must always be at the work spot to see that is carried out under his personal supervision.
3. Work should be done safely.
4. Regulation 106(1) should be fully complied with.
5. If any violation is noticed due to negligence of duties, he will be solely held responsible for the consequences.
6. He should himself fill up all the columns in his daily report book and promptly sign.
7. As advised to you personally by the Deputy Director of Mines Safety on 20th March, 1969 you must follow the regulations and do safe and careful work. The Manager should be daily consulted for taking proper instructions before going to work and report after the termination of work regarding his performance.
8. If he will do no safe work and accident takes place due to his negligence he will be held responsible for the same at Quarry 1.
9. He should not leave the quarry till the shift is over or work completed whichever is last.

For S. Kantilal & Co. Ltd.
Sd/- MANILAL GOSALIA.

I was assigned these duties at Quarry No. 1 at Sirgal Mines as a Foreman and was doing my work there before dismissal of my services.

Short History of the Present Dispute

4. I have an unblemished service of 14 years in the Company and have worked to the complete satisfaction of my superiors and there is not a single note against me. There was never a complaint against me that I was incompetent or dishonest in my duties.

5. One day in the month of March 1969 a theft of explosives and detonators took place in the Sirgal Mines. As reported by the Clerk Prakash Naik it was informed that two boxes of detonators were missing from the explosive godown. This clerk Prakash Naik was also in charge of the Godown from which the explosives were missing and he held the keys to the Godown. At that time the Mines Manager was absent from the mine and I was asked to inform the incident of the missing detonators to the Savordem Office and I had accordingly made a report of this to the Savordem Office. The letter was addressed to the General Manager Mr. Gosalia at the Savordem Office.

6. In reply a letter was sent to the Sirgal Mines addressed to the Mines Manager and also to me to make a report of the theft to the police. I was to make the report to the police in case the Mines Manager was absent from the mines. I had accordingly lodged a complaint of the missing boxes of detonators to the Sanguem Police Station in whose jurisdiction the mine is situated. The police came to the place of theft and held an investigation. During the investigation one of the Clerks Mr. Kundaswamy told the police that he strongly suspected the blaster Mr. M. Dorai who might have committed the theft. Mr. Dorai was arrested and taken to the Sanguem Police Station and there detained. The Company held no departmental inquiry into the incident of the theft of the two boxes of detonators, and after the police report was filed the Company management took no further action to find out the culprits. The incident of theft took place in the first week of March 1969.

7. On the 28th March 1969 I was surprised to receive a letter from the Company Management which read as under:—

Kantilal & Co. Ltd.
Mines Owners
Curchorem, Goa.

No. 23/3/69

Dated 28th March 1969

Shri Dinanath Desai
Foreman
Sirgal Mine

You have been found responsible for the theft of explosives and detonators at Sirgal Mine and the cost of these shall have to be recovered from your salary.

Please explain why your services cannot be dismissed and legal action taken on you for your irresponsibility and misappropriation of the Company property and goods. Your reply should reach this office within 2 days of the date of this letter.

For S. Kantilal & Company Ltd.
(Sd.) MANILAL GOSALIA.

On receipt of this letter I replied that the theft of the explosives had taken place without my knowledge. And that the Mines Manager is responsible for the goods of the Company.

I was subsequently suspended by Letter 29/3/69 dated 29th March 1969 and asked to attend an Inquiry at the Savordem Office on 8th April, 1969. (Letter Enclosures and Marked Annexures 1 and 2).

8. At the so-called inquiry which was conducted by the Labour Officer of the Company and before the said Inquiry I was not issued a Chargesheet enumerating the exact charge for which an inquiry was to be held. At the Inquiry the Company examined two witnesses one Kundaswami who works as a Clerk and Shivram Curdicar Supervisor, neither of them made statements accusing me of the theft of the Explosives and detonators. The Charge of theft of Detonators was not established against me. Besides these two witnesses of the Company no other witnesses were examined in my presence at the inquiry. I pleaded not guilty for the loss of the two boxes of detonators and also informed the Inquiry Officer that the Clerk Prakash Naik was in charge of the Explosive Godown during the day and that he held the keys to the Godown and that during the night he used to keep the keys of the explosive godown with the master on duty. The Masters on duty were either Kundaswamy, Shivram Curdicar, Suresh Moraskar or others. None of the above mentioned persons were however asked to make statements at the inquiry proceedings. Neither was Prakash Naik who held the keys to the explosives Godown brought to make a statement at the Inquiry proceedings.

9. The Inquiry was thus a farce and no charges were proved against me of having stolen the company property and how. The inquiry violated the principles of natural justice and was *mala fide* and motivated only to show that an inquiry was held with nothing to prove against me.

10. After this so-called inquiry into false charge against me of being responsible for which the management had already decided even before the inquiry had started as the letter dated 26th March, 1969 quoted in full above in para 7 making out that I was to pay for the missing detonators from my salary. I received an Order of dismissal No. 14/4/69 dated 14th April, 1969 which reads as under:

Mr. Dinanath Desai,
Quepem, Goa.

Dismissal Order

Further to this Office letter No. 29/3/69 dated the 29th March 1969 as the charges levelled against Mr. Dinanath Desai were proved, the management is constrained to dismiss his service in the Company with immediate effect.

For S. KANTILAL & COMPANY LTD.
Sd: Manilal Gosalia.

11. I state that the dismissal Order passed against me is vitiated and in violation of fair-play, equity and natural justice and is *mala-fide*, unjust and amounts to wrongful dismissal on framed up charges in order to make me a scape-goat for the missing detonators which is a serious offence for which the company can be charged under the explosives act.

12. I further state that I made inquiries about the police complaint I had lodged at the Sanguem Police Station in the first week of March 1969 about the theft of the two boxes of explosives and the arrest of M. Dorai the blaster. The Police Inspector Mr. Kashinath Dessai informed me that the blaster M. Dorai was released on the personal intervention of Mr. Manilal Gosalia the Manager who had come to the police station and had got the blaster released on a statement made by him that the two boxes of Detonatory were found by the Company and there was no need to proceed with the case as filed by the Foreman Mr. Dinanath Desai.

13. I further state that my duties as Foreman at the Sirgal Mines have been enumerated by the Management and which have been quoted in para 3 page 2 of this Statement of Claims. No where is it mentioned that it is part of the duties of the Foreman to supply explosives or detonators which are taken directly by the Blaster from the Mines Explosive Godown and the Incharge of the Explosive Godown Mr. Prakash Naik during the working hours. The account of explosives taken and returned is entirely maintained by the this Incharge of the Explosives Godown. Neither have I during the tenure of my service as a Foreman on the mines of M/s. S. Kantilal handled explosives or kept the account of explosives used for the purpose of blasting.

[See para 13(a) on page 8]

14. I wish to further report that the Company Management have subsequently dispensed with the services of this Prakash Naik who was a temporary employee of the Company. Similarly the temporary services of Kundaswamy, Suresh Moraskar the Masters were dispensed with. Similarly the blaster M. Dorai who was arrested and subsequently released from police custody on the intervention of the Management left service of the company.

15. I state that the action of the Management in dismissing me from service is prejudicial and the incident of the theft of the explosives was used in order to get rid of me as I was one of the senior most members of the staff with 14 years of service and my normal retrenchment from service would be a costly item for the company.

16. I state that the Management in dismissing me from service have violated their own standing orders which makes it obligatory to charge sheet the workman and prove the charges before dismissal from service, neither of which has been done thus violating the principles of natural justice, equity and fair-play and in contravention of the rules of conduct of the company and my dismissal is bad in law.

17. In the circumstances it is prayed that this Honourable Tribunal will be pleased to set aside the order of dismissal and reinstate me in service with full back wages and continuity of service with full payment of compensation for the loss of employment and mental anguish and torture I have been made to suffer for the dismissal for theft of company property for which I am not guilty and which has not been proved either at the departmental inquiry or in a Court of Law. This dismissal amounting to character assassination and deformation.

18. I further crave leave to add, amend or alter this statement of claim if and when found necessary. And further crave leave to file a rejoinder in reply to the written statement of the Company if found advisable.

Dated this 15th day of March 1970.

(Sd.) DINANATH DESSAI.

Verification

I, DINANATH DESSAI, DO HEREBY STATE AND SOLUMNLY AFFIRM THAT THE STATEMENT OF FACTS CONTAINED IN THE ABOVE STATEMENT OF CLAIMS ARE TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF.

(Sd.) DINANATH DESSAI.

Add after Para 13 in Statement of Claims.

Para 13 (a) I wish to state that to the charge of pilferage of diesel made out in the Suspension letter No. 29/3/69 dated 29th March, 1969 I have stated at the Inquiry that there was no theft of Diesel and that in my capacity as Foreman I had already reported that Francis Driver had my accident dashed the Loader on Diesel Drum which had burst. This statement of mine was collaborated at the Inquiry by my witnesses Phillip Dias and R. Sundaram both Mukadams. The Inquiry officer had recorded this statement at the Inquiry proceedings. The Company Management had produced no witnesses to state that I had pilfered the diesel.

(Sd.) DINANATH DESSAI.

ANNEXURE 1

S. KANTILAL & CO. LTD.,
Mine Owners,
Curchorem, Goa.

No. 29/3/69.

Dt. 29th March 1969.

Shri Dinanath Desai,
Foreman,
Sirgal Mine.

You are hereby suspended from duty pending enquiry on charges levelled against you for the pilferage of Explosives and Detonators, and diesel at Sirgal Mine.

For S. Kantilal & Company Ltd.
(Sd.) MANILAL GOSALIA.

CC:—Manager,
Sirgal Mine.

ANNEXURE 2

S. KANTILAL & CO. LTD.,
Mine Owners,
Curchorem, Goa.

No. DE/4.

Dt. 7th April 1969.

Shri Dinanath Desai,
Foreman,
Sirgal Mine (under Suspension).

Dear Sir,

An enquiry will be instituted at 10 A.M. on 8th April 1969 in this office on the charges levelled and proved against you for the pilferage of Explosives and Diesel.

You are hereby given an opportunity to defend yourself. You should attend to the enquiry with personal and documentary evidence/witness to defend yourself.

Yours faithfully,
For S. Kantilal & Company Ltd.
(sd.) NOT LEGIBLE.

SCHEDULE 'B'

EX-2/E

S. KANTILAL & CO., PVT. LTD.,
Mine Owners & Exporters of Mineral Ore,
P.O. Box No. 2.
Curchorem, Goa.

"REGISTERED A/D"

Dated 24th April, 1970

Our Ref. SR/36/274/70.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT NO. 2

NOTICE No. CGIT/2/3 of 1970/236/70

Dated 12th February 1970

Employer.—Messrs. S. Kantilal & Company Private Limited, Curchorem,
with Registered Office at Gosalia Building, Margao-Goa.

V/s.

Their Ex-Workman.—Sri Dinanath Desai.

Written Statement on behalf of the Employer, Messrs. S. Kantilal & Company Pvt. Limited

May it please Your Honour

In reply to the notice No. CGIT/2/3 of 1970/236/70, dated 12th February 1970 in the above connection this is to state as follows:—

1. On 24th March, 1969, the Manager of Sirgal Muddi Mine brought to the notice of the management, pilferage of explosives at the mine. On receipt of this, a personal enquiry was ordered to be conducted by an officer of the company who is impartial and having adequate experience in the affairs of the mine management. Immediately the said officer (the Mining Engineer of the Company) conducted a preliminary enquiry at the mine and submitted his preliminary enquiry report charging Shri Dinanath Desai responsible for the pilferage of explosives at the mine.

2. On 26th March 1969, a Show Cause Notice was issued to Shri Dinanath Desai charging him that he was found responsible for the theft of explosives at the mine and was asked to show cause as to why he should not be dismissed from the service. Within the time allotted the said Dinanath Desai submitted an explanation bearing no date. The said explanation was not found satisfactory and therefore he was suspended from the Company services, by our letter dated 29th March 1969, pending enquiry on charges levelled against him.

3. Having come to understand that the management was going to proceed against him on the charges of which he was already aware, Shri Dinanath Desai reported sick and did not receive the suspension letter. Later, on the expiry of his sick leave, the suspension letter was served on to him, which he initially refused to accept and on the advice of the senior officials of the Company finally accepted it.

4. Thereafter again he was charge-sheeted and a departmental enquiry was conducted. In this enquiry Shri Dinanath Desai was given full opportunity to defend himself against the charges levelled against him.

5. At the time of enquiry, the said Shri Dinanath Desai was present. One witness on his behalf and four witnesses on behalf of the management were examined in the enquiry on 8th April 1969. In the course of enquiry all the witnesses were available for cross examination. All the charges levelled against Shri Dinanath Desai were proved in the course of enquiry, beyond any reasonable doubt. Further, many other malpractices, misappropriation incidents and corrupt practices etc., indulged into by the said Shri Dinanath Desai were brought to light and proved beyond any reasonable doubt, in the course of enquiry.

6. Shri Dinanath Desai had, in the course of enquiry, the opportunity of cross examining all the witnesses, examined on behalf of the management. Similarly, Shri Dinanath Desai also had the opportunity of examining the witness, and examined him, on his behalf but was unsuccessful in repudiating the charges levelled against him.

7. On receipt of the enquiry report in which it was found that the said Shri Dinanath Desai was found guilty under the following provisions of the Standing Orders of the Company: No. 21(a) (4, 5, 11, 12, 27, 28 and 38), the management dismissed the services of Shri Dinanath Desai from the Company by the letter dated 14th April 1969.

8. We humbly submit that the management is fully justified in dismissing the said Shri Dinanath Desai from the company service.

9. Thereafter sometime, in the month of June 1969, the management received a letter No. V-25(27)/69, dated 16th June 1969 from the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central), Vasco-Da-Gama, inviting the management to participate in the conciliation proceedings regarding Shri Dinanath Desai's letter No. nil dated 17th May 1969 addressed to the Asst. Labour Commissioner (Central) Vasco-Da-Gama.

10. In the said conciliation proceedings, Shri Dinanath Desai was represented by one, Mr. George Vaz, who claimed to be an officer bearer of Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union (in fact, to our best knowledge and belief the said Shri Dinanath Desai was never any member of such Union). During the conciliation proceedings in the office of the Asst. Labour Commissioner, (C) Vasco-Da-Gama, Mr. George Vaz referred to the management of this company in an unbecoming

and unwarranted language and therefore the conciliation proceedings could not proceed further in congenial atmosphere. However, the management fully justified its stand in dismissing Shri Dinanath Desai from the service.

In view of the aforesaid, we earnestly pray that the action of the management in dismissing the said Shri Dinanath Desai from service be upheld and the application of Shri Dinanath Desai be dismissed with legal consequences.

Dated, this 24th day of April 1970.

For S. Kantilal & Company Pvt. Ltd.
(Sd.) MANILAL K. GOSALIA.

SCHEDULE 'C'

EX-3/E

S. KANTILAL & CO., PVT. LTD.,
Mine Owners & Exporters of Mineral Ore,
P.O. Box. No. 2,
Curchorem-Goa.

REGISTERED A/D

Our Ref. 36/274/70-CS.

Dt. 25th June 1970.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM- LABOUR COURT NO. 2

NOTICE No. CGIT-2/3 OF 1970/236/70

Dated the 12th February 1970

Employer.—Messrs. S. Kantilal & Company Pvt. Ltd. Curchorem, with
Registered Office at Gosalia Building, Margao

Vs.

Their Ex-Workman.—Shri Dinanath Desai.

Counter Statement in reply to the Statement of Claims of the Ex-Workman

In reply to the statement of Claim dated the 15th March 1970 of Shri Dinanath Desai, we file our counter statement as under:—

With reference to para 3 of the statement of claim, it is stated that Shri Dinanath Desai was designated as Foreman for the purposes of the provisions under Matalliferous Mines Regulations, 1961 and for that purpose the duties cited by him in the said paragraph were assigned to him in compliance with the said Matalliferous Mines Regulations. It is also stated that these are in the form of instructions for safe working of the mine and they are not the exclusive duties of the Foreman. It is stated that Shri Dinanath Desai was "in charge of the mine" and as such he was assigned additional duties which also included the safe custody of explosives, diesel and other machinery etc., at the mine. It may be noted that Shri Dinanath Desai has himself admitted in the said para that he was assigned duties periodically. Further, Shri Dinanath Desai was incharge of the mine, was in overall management of the same and was responsible for all the affairs of the management at the mine.

With reference to para 4 of the claim, it is denied that Shri Dinanath Desai had an unblemished service of 14 years in the Company and that he had worked to the complete satisfaction of his superiors and that there was not a single note against him. It is also denied that there was no complaint against him. In this regard it is stated that on 8th June 1968, Shri Dinanath Desai was asked to show cause and to explain why disciplinary action should not be taken against him for accepting bribes. He submitted his explanation which was received by us on 11th June 1968 and the same was not found to be satisfactory. However, a lenient view was taken in the matter and he was warned that any repetition would be viewed seriously and disciplinary action would be taken against him, vide our letter dated the 11th June, 1968. Again on 27th February 1969, the Manager incharge vide his letter No. 582/IMM/Sirgal/complained against the illegitimate use of the powers given to Shri Dinanath Desai and that Shri Dinanath was indulging in undesirable favours to the contractors at the mine. Besides, there were several other complaints against him, one such being from Shri Dorai complaining about the various irregularities and misuse of powers by Shri Dinanath Desai.

All the aforesaid complaints, explanation, warning etc. are exhibited collectively to this reply.

With reference to paras. 3, 6 and 7 of the statement of claim, it is stated that Shri Dinanath Desai is trying to confuse and confound facts in order to create confusion in the minds of this Honourable tribunal. The facts cited in the said paras have nothing to do with the case against Shri Dinanath Desai. It is stated that after the matter of pilferage of explosives etc., had come to the notice of the management, the Sirgal mine office was directed to lodge a complaint to the police. However, the charges made against Shri Dinanath Desai and his consequent dismissal are independent and based upon the enquiry report. On 24th March 1969, the management received a letter from the Manager of Sirgal mine, who joined duty on 22nd March 1969, stating that he found gelatine stored in some other quarters than the original place. He further stated that the stock in hand did not tally with the stock shown in the record book. The said letter is exhibited here. Further separately he made a detailed report complaining about the various irregularities and pilferage of explosive etc., at the mine.

The management, consequently, thought it advisable to look in to the matters and investigate the same. The mines manager in his report made it clear that Shri Dinanath Desai was responsible for the pilferage of explosives other irregularities. On this, the management ordered a preliminary enquiry to be conducted by an officer of the Company, who after enquiry submitted his preliminary report charging Shri Dinanath Desai as responsible for the pilferage of explosives at the mine.

On 26th March 1969 a show cause notice was issued to Shri Dinanath Desai charging him that he was found responsible for the theft of explosives at the mine and was asked to show cause as to why he should not be dismissed from service. The explanation submitted by Shri Dinanath Desai to this was not found to be satisfactory and as such *vide* the Company's letter No. 29/3/69 dated the 29th March 1969, he was suspended pending enquiry on the charges levelled against him. The charges levelled against Shri Dinanath Desai regarding which enquiry was to be held are quite clear from the Company's letters dated the 26th March 1969 and 29th March 1969 and the chargesheet given to him before conducting the enquiry.

With reference to para 8 of the claim, it is stated that it is not true that the exact charges were not enumerated before the enquiry was held. It is further not true that the enquiry was conducted by the Labour Officer of the Company. It is stated that the enquiry was conducted by an officer of the Company, who works as a Mining Engineer's of the Company and who is impartial and has got adequate experience at the mines and in their management. It is not true that apart from Shri Kandaswamy and Shri Shivram Khandeparker no other witnesses of the Company were examined in the presence of Shri Dinanath Desai. It is stated that Shri Dinanath Desai was present and participated in the enquiry and apart from himself, also examined witnesses on his behalf. Witnesses on behalf of the company were also examined in the presence of Shri Dinanath Desai apart from Shri Kandaswamy and Shri Shivram Khandeparker, and they were all available for Cross Examination by him. The enquiry officer submitted his enquiry report dated the 8th April 1969 and it was found that Shri Dinanath Desai was found guilty of violating the provisions of the Company Standing Orders. The management therefore dismissed the services of Shri Dinanath Desai *vide* letter No. 14/4/69 dated the 14th April, 1969.

With further reference to para 8 of the claim, it is stated that it is not true that Shri Prakash Naik was in charge of explosives and that the keys were with Shri Prakash Naik. Further, it is not true that during night time the keys were given to the masters. It is also not true that none of the masters was asked to make statements at the time of enquiry.

With reference to the para 9 of the claim it is denied that the enquiry was a farce and that no charges were against him proved. It is denied that the enquiry has violated any principles of natural justice and that was mala fide and motivated only to show that an enquiry was held with nothing to prove against Shri Dinanath Desai.

With reference to para 11, it is denied that the dismissal order is in violation of fair play, equity and natural justice and that mala fide, unjust and amounts to wrongful dismissal on framed up charges in order to make Shri Dinanath Desai

a scape goat for the missing detonators which is serious offence for which the company can be charged under the explosives act.

With reference to para 12, it is stated that contents of the same are not relevant to the present case.

With reference to para 13 of the claim, it is stated that the duties as Foreman which were enumerated were the instructions only for the purposes of Matalliferous Mines Regulations, 1961 for the safe working of the mine and in addition to the above instructions, Shri Dinanath Desai was "In charge of the mine" and had other duties namely overall management of the mine, which includes the safe custody of the explosives, diesel etc.

With reference to the para 15 of the claim we deny that the action of the management in dismissing Shri Dinanath Desai is prejudicial and that the incident of theft of explosives was used in order to get rid of him as he was one of the senior most members of staff with 14 years of service and his normal retrenchment would be a costly item for the management of the Company. It is stated that the action of the management was fully justified and that the charges against Shri Dinanath Desai were proved beyond any reasonable doubt.

With reference to para 16 of the claim, it is denied that there was any violation of the Standing Orders of the Company and that there was any violation of any principles of natural justice, equity and fair play by the management. It is submitted that proper and full enquiry was held and fair opportunities were given to Shri Dinanath Desai to defend himself.

It is therefore prayed that the prayer and the application of Shri Dinanath Desai be dismissed with legal consequences and the action of the management in dismissing Shri Dinanath Desai from service be upheld.

Dated this the 25th June, 1970.

For S. KANTILAL & COMPANY PRIVATE LTD.

M. K. GOSALIA.

[No. 24/75/69-LR-IV.]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 27th November 1970

S.O. 4045.—Whereas the industrial dispute specified in the Schedule hereto annexed is pending before Shri S. C. Barua, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Dibrugarh;

And whereas the services of Shri S. C. Barua have ceased to be available;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and sub-section (1) of section 33B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri G. N. Borah, as the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Dibrugarh, and withdraws the proceeding in relation to the said dispute from Shri S. C. Barua and transfers the same to the said Industrial Tribunal, Dibrugarh for the disposal of the said proceeding with the direction that the said Tribunal shall proceed with the proceeding from the stage at which it is transferred to it and dispose of the same according to law.

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Parties to the dispute	Reference No. and date of Industrial dispute	S. O. of Gazette
			Year of Publication
1.	Messrs. Assam Oil Company Limited Digboi and their workmen represented by Assam Oil Company Labour Union, Digboi.	No. 25(18)'67-LRI dated the 1st March, 1968.	904/68

[No. 25/18/67-LR I/LR IV.]

आवेष्ट

नई दिल्ली, 27 नवम्बर, 1970

का० प्रा० 4045.—यतः इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद, श्री एस० सी० बरुआ, पीठासीन अधिकारी, औद्योगिक अधिकरण दिब्रूगढ़ के समक्ष लम्बित है ;

और, यतः श्री एस० सी० बरुआ की सेवाएं उपलब्ध नहीं रही हैं ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7—क और धारा 33—ख की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री जी० एन० बोराह होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालया दिब्रूगढ़ होगा और श्री एस० सी० बरुआ से उक्त विवाद से सम्बद्ध कार्यवाही को वापिस लेती है और उसे उक्त कार्यवाही के निपटान के लिए उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण दिब्रूगढ़ को इस निर्देश के साथ स्थानांतरित करती है कि उक्त अधिकरण और आगे कार्यवाही उस प्रक्रम से करेगा जिस पर वह उसे स्थानांतरित की जाए और विधि के अनुसार उसका निपटान करेगा ।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	विवाद के पक्षकार	औद्योगिक विवाद की निर्देश संख्या और तारीख	राजपत्र में का०प्रा० संख्या/प्रकाशन का वर्ष
1—	मैसर्स असम आयल कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डिगबोई और उनके कर्मकार, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व असम आयल कम्पनी लेबर यूनियन, डिगबोई करती है ।	सं० 25(18)/67—एल० आर०—1, तारीख प्रथम मार्च, 1968	904/68

[सं० 25(18)/67—एल०आर०—1—एल० आर०-4]

New Delhi, the 28th October 1970

S.O. 4046.—Whereas in the course of conciliation proceedings the employers in relation to the management of Star Construction and Transport Company, Sankari West and their workmen represented by India Cement Employees' Union, Sankari West arrived at a settlement on the 7th April, 1969;

And, whereas, in the opinion of the Central Government a doubt has arisen as to the interpretation of the said settlement on the question specified in the Schedule hereto annexed, and the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the question for interpretation;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sections 7A and 36A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Thiru S. Swamikkannu, as Presiding Officer with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the management of Star Construction and Transport Company, Sankari West P.O. Salem District have correctly interpreted and implemented clause (5) of the mutual settlement dated the 7th April, 1969 in permitting sub-contract system at the unloading point? If not, are the workmen engaged by the sub-contractors required to be absorbed by the Management of Messrs. Star Construction and Transport Company?

[No. 36(49)/69-LR IV.]

नई दिल्ली, 28 नवम्बर, 1970

का० प्रा० 3046.—अतः सुलह कार्यावाही के दौरान स्टार कंस्ट्रक्शन एण्ड ट्रांसपोर्ट कम्पनी, संकरी वस्त के प्रबन्धकत्त से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और उनके कमकार, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व इंडियन सीमेंट एम्प्लाइज यूनियन, संकरी वस्त करती है, 7 अप्रैल, 1969 को एक परिनिर्धारण कर लिया;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय में इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रश्न पर उक्त परिनिर्धारण के अर्थान्वयन के सम्बन्ध में एक संदेह पैदा हो गया है और केन्द्रीय सरकार इस प्रश्न को अर्थान्वयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और 36-क द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री थिड एस० स्वामिक्कन्नु होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या स्टार कंस्ट्रक्शन एण्ड ट्रांसपोर्ट कम्पनी, डाकघर संकरी वस्त, जिला सालेम के प्रबन्धकत्त ने भार उतारने वाले स्थान पर उपठेका-पद्धति बनाने की अनुमति देते समय तारीख 7 अप्रैल, 1969 के पारस्परिक परिनिर्धारण के खण्ड (5) का सही अर्थान्वयन और कार्यान्वयन किया है ? यदि नहीं, तो क्या उपठेकेदार द्वारा लगाए गए कर्मकारों को मैसर्स स्टार कंस्ट्रक्शन ट्रांसपोर्ट कम्पनी के प्रबन्ध द्वारा शामिल किया जाना अपेक्षित है ?

[सं० 36 (49)/69-एल० ग्रा०-4]

New Delhi, the 3rd December 1970

S.O. 4047.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Bansdeopur Colliery of Messrs New Bansdeopur Colliery Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Bansdeopur Colliery of Messrs New Bansdeopur Coal Company Private Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad, having regard to their financial capacity are justified in not introducing wage structure and other benefits in accordance with the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for the Coal Mining Industry as accepted by the Government of India in their Resolution No. WB-16(5)/66, dated the 21st July, 1967? If not, what should be the Wage structure and other benefits in respect of the workmen concerned and from which date?”

[No. 2/92/70-LRII.]

नई दिल्ली, 3 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4047:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स न्यू बंसदेओपुर कोलियरी कम्पनी (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, डाकघर कुसुन्डा, जिला धनबाद की बंसदेओपुर कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्दिष्ट करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 2), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स न्यू बंसओपुर कोल कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, डाकघर कुसुन्डा जिला धनबाद की बंसदेओपुर कोलियरी के प्रबंधतन्त्र की वित्तीय क्षमता को ध्यान में रखते हुए, उसके द्वारा भारत सरकार द्वारा अपने संकल्प संख्या वे०बी०-16(5)/66, तारीख 21 जुलाई, 1967 में स्वीकृत कोयला खनन उद्योग के लिए केन्द्रीय मजूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिशों के अनुसार मजदूरी विन्यास तथा अन्य फायदे शुरू न किया जाना न्यायाचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकारों के लिए मजदूरी विन्यास तथा अन्य लाभ क्या होने चाहिएं और किस तारीख से?”

[सं० 2/92/70-एल०आर०-2]

S.O. 4048.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Birhnipat Bauxite Mine of Messrs Hindustan Aluminium Corporation, Post Office Richughuta, District Palamau (Bihar) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Birhnipat Bauxite Mine of Hindustan Aluminium Corporation, Post Office Richughuta, District Palamau (Bihar) were justified in denying employment to 114 workmen out of the 218 workmen of ex-contractor of the said Mine on reopening and resuming of work with effect from 8th March, 1970 under the Company's own Management? If not, to what relief the said workmen are entitled?”

[No. 10/31/70-LRIV.]

का०आ० 4048:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स हिन्दुस्तान एल्युमिनियम कारपोरेशन, डाकघर रिचुघुटा, जिला पालामू (बिहार) की बिर्हनीपत बौक्साइट खान के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना ठीक ही समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स हिन्दुस्तान एल्युमिनियम कारपोरेशन, डाकघर रिकुधुटा, जिला पासामू (बिहार) की विहूनीपत बोक्साइट खान के प्रबन्धतंत्र का, कम्पनी के अपने प्रबन्ध के अन्तर्गत उक्त खान के 8-3-70 से पुनः खुलने और काम शुरू करने पर उसके भूतपूर्व ठकेदार के 218 कर्मकारों में से 114 कर्मकारों को नियोजित करने से इनकार करना न्यायोचित था? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं।

[सं० 10/31/70—एल० आर० 4]

New Delhi, the 8th December 1970

S.O. 4049.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Khas Joyrampur Colliery of Messrs Khas Joyrampur Colliery Company Private Limited, Post Office Jharia (Dhanbad) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Khas Joyrampur Colliery of Messrs Khas Joyrampur Colliery Company Private Limited, Post Office Jharia (Dhanbad) in terminating the services of Shri Chandrama Singh, Haulage Khalasi with effect from the 12th June, 1970 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

[No. 2/153/70-LR.II.]

नई दिल्ली, 8 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4049 —यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स खास जोयरामपुर कोलियरी कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, डाकघर झरिया (धनबाद) की खास जोयरामपुर कोलियरी से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (संख्या 2) धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स खास जोयरामपुर कोलियरी कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, डाकबर झरिया (धनबाद) की खास जोयरामपुर कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतंत्र की श्री चन्द्रमार्गसिंह, हीलेज खलासी की सेवा की 12 जून, 1970 से समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है।”

[सं० 2/153/70/एल० आर०-2]

S.O. 4050.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Nowrozabad Colliery, Post Office Nowrozabad, District Shahdol (Madhya Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Demand No. 3.—Whether the scales of pay prescribed by the management of Nowrozabad Colliery of Associated Cement Company Limited, Nowrozabad, Kotma, District Shahdol for their clerical staff need any revision? If so, details thereof and method of their fixation in various revised grades?

Demand No. 39.—Whether the allowance paid to the line mazdoors of back shifts, by the management of Nowrozabad Colliery of Associated Cement Company Limited, Nowrozabad, Kotma, District Shahdol in addition to their category wage for doing some extra work in course of normal duty is justified; if not what relief they are entitled to?

Demand No. 1(i).—Whether in view of the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry, the workload of miners of Nowrozabad Colliery of Associated Cement Company Limited, Post Office Nowrozabad, District Shahdol requires to be revised? If so, what piece-rate should be fixed for the work of dressing and loading for them and from what date?

Demand No. 1(ii).—Whether the rate of payment per tub made by Associated Cement Company Limited, Nowrozabad Colliery, Post Office Nowrozabad, District Shahdol to their miners for lead and lift and for ancillary jobs of helping the drill operator, helping the shotfirer in steaming shothole, dragging the cable and empty tub pushing need be revised? If so, to what relief are the workmen entitled and from what date?

Demand No. 2.—Whether the allowance paid by the management of Nowrozabad Colliery of Associated Cement Company Limited, Nowrozabad, District Shahdol to their Trammers for coupling, signalling and setting of points etc. needs revision? If so, to what relief are the workmen entitled and from what date?

Demand No. 23.—Whether the management of Nowrozabad Colliery of Associated Cement Company Limited, Nowrozabad, District Shahdol is justified in paying an allowance of 15 Paise to the Hammermen operating power hammer? If not to what relief are the workmen entitled and from what date?

Demand No. 25.—Whether the allowance paid to the loco helpers of Nowrozabad Colliery of Associated Cement Company Limited, Nowrozabad, District Shahdol in addition to their category wage for doing additional work of coupling, signalling and setting of points etc., is justified? If not, to what relief are they entitled and from what date?

Demand No. 29.—Whether the action of the management of Nowrozabad Colliery of Associated Cement Company Limited, Post Office Nowrozabad, District Shahdol in placing Shri Zahur Khan, CCM Driver in Category V of the Coal Wage Board Recommendations is justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled and from what date?

Demand No. 33.—Whether the management of Nowrozabad Colliery of Associated Cement Company Limited is justified in paying an allowance 9 Paise to the Survey Mazdoor Shri Nimalya? If not, to what relief is he entitled and from what date?

[No. 5/23/68-LR-II.]

का० आ० 4050.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी, डाकघर नौरोजाबाद, जिला शहडोल (मध्य प्रदेश) के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जवनपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

- मांग संख्या 3 “क्या एसोसियेटेड सीमेंट कम्पनी लिमिटेड, नौरोजाबाद, कोतमा, जिला शहडोल की नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतंत्र द्वारा अपने लिपिकीय कर्मचारीबृन्द के लिए विहित बेतन-मानों में किसी पुनरीक्षण की आवश्यकता है? यदि हां, तो उसका व्यौरा तथा विभिन्न पुनरीक्षित ग्रेडों में उनके नियतन की विधि।
- मांग संख्या 39 क्या एसोसियेटेड सीमेंट कम्पनी लिमिटेड, नौरोजाबाद, कोतमा, जिला शहडोल की नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतंत्र द्वारा बैंक शिफ्टों के लाइन मजदूरों को प्रसामान्य ड्यूटी के दौरान कुछ अतिरिक्त कार्य करने के लिए उनकी प्रवर्ग मजदूरी के अतिरिक्त दिया गया भत्ता न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो वे किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?
- मांग संख्या 1(i) क्या कोयला खनन उद्योग के केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिशों को ध्यान में रखते हुए, एसोसियेटेड सीमेंट कम्पनी लिमिटेड सीमेंट डाकघर नौरोजाबाद, जिला शहडोल की नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी के कर्मचारों के कार्यभार का पुनरीक्षण करने की आवश्यकता है? यदि हां, तो ड्रेसिंग और लॉडिंग के कार्य के लिए उनके लिए कौन सी मात्रानुपाती दर नियत की जानी चाहिए और किस तारीख से?
- मांग संख्या 1(ii) क्या एसोसियेटेड सीमेंट कम्पनी लिमिटेड, नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी, डाकघर नौरोजाबाद, जिला शहडोल द्वारा अपने खनिकों को लीड और लिफ्ट के लिए और ड्रिल ऑपरेटर की मदद करने के आनुषंगिक कार्यों, शाट फायरर की शाटहोल में भाप छोड़ने हेतु मदद करने, केबल खींचने और खाली टब धकेलने के कार्य के लिए प्रति टब संदाय की दर का पुनरीक्षण करने की आवश्यकता है? यदि हां, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार है और किस तारीख से?

- मांग संख्या 2 क्या एसोसियेटेड सीमेंट कम्पनी लिमिटेड, नौरोजाबाद, जिला शहडोल की नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन द्वारा अपने दूसरों को कर्माग, संकेत देने (सिग्नलिंग) और प्वायन्ट सेट करने आदि के लिए दिये गये भत्ते का पुनरोक्षण करने की आवश्यकता है? यदि हाँ, तो कर्मकार किन अनुतोष के हकदार हैं और किस तारीख से?
- मांग संख्या 23 क्या एसोसियेटेड सीमेंट कम्पनी लिमिटेड, नौरोजाबाद, जिला शहडोल की नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन की पावर हैमर का प्रचालन करने वाले हैमरमैनों को 15 घंटे तक का भत्ता देने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किन अनुतोष के हकदार हैं और किस तारीख से?
- मांग संख्या 25 क्या एसोसियेटेड सीमेंट कम्पनी लिमिटेड, नौरोजाबाद, जिला शहडोल की नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी के लोको मद्दगारों को, कर्माग, संकेत देने (सिग्नलिंग) और प्वायन्ट सेट करने आदि के अतिरिक्त कार्य के लिए उनकी प्रथम मजदूरी के अतिरिक्त, दिया गया भत्ता न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो वे किन अनुतोष के हकदार हैं और किस तारीख से?
- मांग संख्या 29 क्या एसोसियेटेड सीमेंट कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डाकघर नौरोजाबाद, जिला शहडोल की नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन की श्री जहूर खा, सी सी एम, चालक की कोयला मजदूरी बोर्ड की भिकारियों के प्रथम 5 में रखने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस अनुतोष का हकदार है और किन तारीख से?
- मांग संख्या 33 क्या एसोसियेटेड सीमेंट कम्पनी लिमिटेड की नौरोजाबाद कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन का सर्वेक्षण मजदूर श्री निभैया को 9 घंटे भत्ता देना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस अनुतोष के हकदार है और किस तारीख से?"

[सं० 5/23/68-एल०आर०-2]

New Delhi, the 9th December 1970

S.O. 4051.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Benalee Colliery of Messrs Nimcha Coal Company Limited, Post Office Nandi, District Burdwan, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Benalee Colliery was justified in not allowing Shri Kamala Kant Misra, Time Keeper with effect from the 24th March, 1970 and Shri Jagannath Dubey, Driller and Shri Ramanand Pandey, Guard with effect from the 28th March, 1970 to resume their duties?

If not, to what relief these workmen are entitled?"

[No. 1/33/70-LR-II.]

मई दिल्ली, 9 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० प्रो० 4050.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स निम्चा कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड डाकघर नन्ही, जिला वर्धवान की बनावली कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या बनावली कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतन्त्र का श्री कमला कांत मिश्र, टाहमकीपर को 24 मार्च, 1970 से और श्री जगन्नाथ दुबे ड़िलर और श्री रामानन्द पांडे, गार्ड को 28 मार्च, 1970 से अपनी ड्यूटी पुनः आरम्भ न करने देना न्यायोचित था ? यदि नहीं, तो ये कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं।

[सं० 1/33/70—एल०प्रार०—2]

S.O. 4052.—WHEREAS The Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Khas Sijua Colliery of Messrs Khas Sijua Coal Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Sijua, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed:

AND WHEREAS the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Khas Sijua Colliery of Messrs Khas Sijua Coal Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Sijua, District Dhanbad, in refusing employment to the under-mentioned workmen from the date mentioned against each is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?”

the workmen						Designation	Date of stoppage of work.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Haricharan Nonja	Wagon Loader	15-5-1970
2	Burzu Lal Nonja	Do.	Do.
3	Monia Kamin	Do.	Do.
4	Jagdish Nonja	Do.	Do.
5	Mahaswer Kamin	Do.	Do.
6	Alkhi Kamin (I)	Do.	Do.
7	Magre Kamin	Do.	Do.
8	Rammudin Nonja	Do.	Do.
9	Daratni Kamin	Do.	Do.

I	2	3	4
10	Mahajoy Nonia	Wagon Loader	15-5-1970
11	Ram Bhajan Nonia.	Do.	Do.
12	Chanri Nonia.	Do.	Do.
13	Mangri Kamin.	Do.	Do.
14	Dewsaran Nonia.	Do.	Do.
15	Domatja Kamin	Do.	Do.
16	Munarik Nonia	Do.	Do.
17	Bachu Kamin	Do.	Do.
18	Sabran Nonia	Do.	Do.
19	Sankar Nonia.	Do.	Do.
20	Dankashri Kamin	Do.	Do.
21	Ram Prasad Nonia.	Do.	Do.
22	Dularia Kamin	Do.	Do.
23	Harihar Nonia.	Do.	Do.
24	Barti Kamin	Do.	Do.
25	Mangar Nonja	Do.	Do.
26	Jhimri Kamin	Do.	Do.

[No. 2/137/70-LR. II]

का० आ० 40 52.—यत : केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मसर्स खास सिजुआ कोल कम्पनी (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, डाकघर सिजुआ, जिला धनबाद की खास सिजुआ कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यत: केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (संख्या 2), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मसर्स खास सिजुआ कोल कम्पनी (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, डाकघर सिजुआ, जिला धनबाद की खास सिजुआ कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतन्त्र का नीचे वर्णित कर्मकारों को प्रत्येक के नाम से सामने दी गई तारीख से नियोजित करने से इन्कार करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो सम्बंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार है?”

क्रमसं०	कर्मकार का नाम	पदनाम	काम बन्द करने की तारीख
1.	हरिचरन नोनिया	वेगन लोडर	15-5-1970
2.	बुरजू लाल नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
3.	मोनिया कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
4.	जगदीश नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
5.	महास्वर कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
6.	अल्खी कामिन (1)	यथोपरि	यथोपरि

1	2	3	4
7.	माप्ने कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
9.	रामूद्दीन नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
9.	झारातनी कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
10.	महाजोय नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
11.	राम भजन नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
12.	चल्ली नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
13.	मांग्री कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
14.	देवमरन नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
15.	डोमाटिया कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
16.	मुनारिक नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
17.	बचु कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
18.	साम्रान नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
19.	संकर नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
20.	डंकेशरी कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
21.	राम प्रसाद नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
22.	दुसरिया कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
23.	हरिहर नोनिया	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
24.	बारटी कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि
25.	भांगर नोनिया	वेगन लोडर	15-5-1970
26.	झिमरी कामिन	यथोपरि	यथोपरि

[सं० 2/137/70-एल०ग्रार०2]

S.O. 4053.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the East Bhuggatdih Colliery of Messrs East Bhuggatdih Colliery Company Private Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of East Bhuggatdih Colliery of Messrs East Bhuggatdih Colliery Company Private Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad, in dismissing Shri Hari Kamal Mitra, Mining Sirdar, with effect from the 18th May, 1970 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

[No. 2/149/70-LR.II.]

का० आ० 4053.—यत : केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स ईस्ट भुगतडीह कोलियरी कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, डाकघर झरिया, जिला धनबाद की ईस्ट भुगतडीह कोलियरी से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यत : केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार के औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 2) धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स ईस्ट भुगतडीह कोलियरी कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, डाकघर झरिया, जिला धनबाद की ईस्ट भुगतडीह कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्री हरी कमल मित्रा, खनन सरदार को 18 मई, 1970 से पदच्युत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी ? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[सं० 2/149/70-एल० आर०-2]

S.O. 4054.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Kedla Colliery, Post Office Ghatotand, Hazaribagh, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Kedla Colliery, Post Office Ghatotand, District Hazaribagh, in terminating the employment of Shri K. P. Singh, Despatch Clerk, with effect from the 1st November, 1969 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

[No. 2/151/70-LR.II.]

का० आ० 4054.—यत : केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में केदला कोलियरी, डाकघर, घाटोटांड, हजारी बाग से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यत : केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 2), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या केदला कोलियरी, डाकघर घाटोटांड जिला हजारीबाग के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्री कै० पी० सिंह, प्रेषणुलिपिक के नियोजन को एक नवम्बर, 1969 से समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी ? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है।”

[सं० 2/151/70-एल० आर० -2]

S.O. 4055.—Whereas the industrial dispute specified in the Schedule hereto annexed was pending before the National Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted by the Central Government under section 7B and sub-section (1A) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) with Shri Kamal Sahai, as Presiding Officer, *vide* notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3088, dated the 21st August, 1968,

And, whereas the said Tribunal had ceased functioning with effect from the 1st December, 1969, consequent on the retirement of Shri Kamal Sahai, the Presiding Officer of the Tribunal,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1A) of section 10 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby refers the dispute for adjudication to the National Industrial Tribunal at New Delhi constituted under S.O. No. 3639, dated 2-11-1970.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Parties to the dispute	No. of reference	Date of Reference.
1.	The General Manager, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Baroda, and the Director of Administration, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Delhi, and their workmen represented by Oil and Natural Gas Commission Employees Mazdoor Sabha, Baroda.	S. O. 3088	21-8-68

[No. 4 (24)/67-LRIII (LRIV)]

का० आ० 4055 —यनः इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-ख और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1क) के अधीन, भारत सरकार के श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3088, तारीख 21 अगस्त, 1968 के द्वारा, गठित राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक अधिकरण, धनबाद, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री कमला सहाय थे, के समक्ष लम्बित था।

और यनः अधिकरण के पीठासीन अधिकारी, श्री कमला सहाय, की सेवा निवृत्ति के परिणाम-स्वरूप उक्त अधिकरण ने प्रथम दिसम्बर, 1969 से कार्य करना बन्द कर दिया था;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली जो का० आ० 3639, तारीख 2-11-1970 के अन्तर्गत गठित हुआ है, निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	विवाद के पक्षकार	निर्देश सं०	निर्देश की तारीख
1.	महाप्रबन्धक, तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, बड़ोदा और प्रमानन निदेशक, तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, तेल भवन, देहरादून और उनके कर्मकार जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व आयल एण्ड नेचुरल गैस कमीशन एम्पलायोज मजदूर ममा, बड़ोदा करती है ।	का० आ० 3088	21-8-68

[सं० 4 (24)/67-एल० आर० III (एल० आर० IV)]

S.O. 4056.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Kothagudem Collieries (Andhra Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri T. Chandrasekhara Reddy, as Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Afzal Lodge, Tilak Road, Ramkote, Hyderabad-1, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Shanti Khani (Bellampalli Division, Singareni Collieries Company Limited) was justified in laying off 166 fillers of gangs Number 11, 12, 17 and 18 of Dip Number 20 without wages for the period from the 1st May, 1970 to the 12th May, 1970? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

[No. 7/17/70-LR.II.]

का० आ० 4056.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में सिंगारेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डाकघर कोथागुडियम कोलियरीज (आंध्र प्रदेश) से सम्बद्ध निर्योजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० चन्द्रासेखर रेड्डी होंगे, जिनका मुक्यालय अफजल लोड, तिलक रोड, रामकोट, हैदराबाद-1 होगा और उक्त विवाद उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्याय निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

"क्या शांति खनि (बेलमपल्ली डिवीजन, सिंगारेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड) के प्रबन्धतंत्र का डिप संख्या 20 के गैंग संख्या 11, 12, 17 और 18 के 166 फिल्लरों की 1 मई, 1970 से 12 मई, 1970 तक की कालावधि के लिए कामबन्दी करना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किन अनुबोध के हकदार हैं?"

[सं० 7/17/70-एल० आर०-2]

New Delhi, the 10th December 1970

S.O. 4057.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Singareni Collieries Company, Limited, Post Office Kothagudem Collieries (Andhra Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri T. Chandrasekhara Reddy as Presiding Officer with headquarters at Afzal Lodge, Tilak Road, Ramkote, Hyderabad-1, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of the Singareni Collieries Company Limited in laying off all the underground workers (except electricians etc.) in the second shift on the 12th August, 1969 and in paying them only half wages for the day, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

[No. 1/39/70-LR-II.]

नई दिल्ली, 10 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4057:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में सिंगारेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डाकघर कोथागूडियम कालियरीज (आंध्र प्रदेश) से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० चन्द्रासेखर रेड्डी होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय अफ़ज़ल लाज, तिलक रोड, रामकोट, हैदराबाद-1 होगा और उक्त विवाद उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

"क्या सिंगारेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धतंत्र की सभी भूमिगत कर्मकारों (इलेक्ट्रिशियनों आदि को छोड़कर) की 12 अगस्त, 1969 को दूसरी पारी में काम से जबरी छुट्टी देने और उन्हें उस दिन की केवल आधी भजदूरी देने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?"

[सं० 1/39/70-एल० आर०-2]

S.O. 4058.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Murulidhar 20/21 Pits Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited, Post Office Mohuda, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And Whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the undermentioned workmen were locked out on the dates mentioned against each by the management of Murulidih 20/21 Pits Colliery of Messrs Bengal Coal Company Limited, Post Office Mohuda, District Dhanbad? If so, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

Sl. No.	Name of the workmen	Designation	Date of stoppage of work
1.	Bhimraj Mahato	C. C. Machine Driver	10-4-1970
2.	Dhuma Mahato	Do.	11-4-1970
3.	Ch. Rezak Mia.	Do.	Do.
4.	Topi Roy	C.C.M. Driver-cum-Helper	Do.
5.	Rasik Mahato	C.C.M. Driver	Do.
6.	Muslim Ansari	Do.	Do.
7.	Ramdhani Teli	Do.	Do.
8.	Sitaram Bouri	Do.	Do.

[No. 2/115/70-LR II]

का० प्रा० 4058.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मसस बंगाल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डाकघर मोहुदा, जिला धनबाद की मुरलीडीह 20-21 पिट्स कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्दिष्ट करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिवरण (संख्या 2) धनबाद, को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्दिष्ट करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या मसस बंगाल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डाकघर मोहुदा, जिला धनबाद की मुरलीडीह 20/21 पिट्स कोलियरी के प्रबन्धतंत्र द्वारा निम्नलिखित कर्मकारों को प्रत्येक के सामने लिखी गई ताखों को काम से बंद कर दिया गया था। यदि हां, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुसूची के हकदार हैं ?

क्रम सं०	कर्मकारों के नाम	पदनाम	काम बंद करने की तारीख
1.	भीमराज महतो	सी० सी० मशीन चालक	10-4-1970
2.	धुमा महतो	यथोक्त	11-4-1970
3.	चोधरी रजक मियां	यथोक्त	11-4-1970
4.	टोपी राय	सी०सी०एम० चालक एवं मद्दगार	11-4-1970
5.	रसिक महतो	सी०सी०एम० चालक	11-4-1970
6.	मुस्लिम अनसारी	यथोक्त	11-4-1970
7.	रामधनी तेली	यथोक्त	11-4-1970
8.	सीताराम बीरी	यथोक्त	11-4-1970

[सं० 2/115/70-एल० आर० 2]

S.O. 4059—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of South Govindpur Colliery, Post Office Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And Whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (r) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 2 Dhanbad constituted under section 7A of the Said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of South Govindpur Colliery, Post Office Katrasgarh, District Dhanbad in stopping the following workmen from their work from the dates mentioned against their names is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?”.

Sl. No.	Name	Designation	Date of stoppage of work
1	Jalaluddin Mian	Timber Mistry	8-12-1969
2	Ali Mohammed.	Timber Mazdoor.	27-11-1969
3	Suleman Mian	Timber Mistry.	27-11-1969
4	Jaminuddin Mian.	Timber Mazdoor.	27-11-1969
5	Mohiuddin Mian.	Timber Mistry.	8-11-1969.

[No. 2/163/70-LRII]

का० आ० 4059:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को राय है कि दमते उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विरामों के बारे में साउथ गोविन्दपुर कोलियरी, डाकघर कतरसगढ़, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धनत्रय से सम्बद्ध निरोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 2) धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

“क्या साउथ गोविन्दपुर कोलियरी, डाकघर कतरसगढ़, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धनत्रय की निम्नलिखित कर्मकारों को उनके नामों के सामने लिखी गई तारीखों से काम से रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

क्रम सं०	नाम	पदनाम	काम बन्द करने की तारीख
1	जलालुद्दीन मियाँ	टिम्बर मिस्त्री	8-12-1969
2	अली मोहम्मद	टिम्बर मजदूर	27-11-1969
3	सुलेमान मियाँ	टिम्बर मिस्त्री	27-11-1969
4	जमीनुद्दीन मियाँ	टिम्बर मजदूर	27-11-1969
5	मोहिद्दीन मियाँ	टिम्बर मिस्त्री	8-11-1969

[नं० 2/163/70-एन० आर०-2]

S.O. 4060.—Whereas, the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Kothagudem Collieries (Andhra Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri T. Chandrasekhara Reddy, as Presiding Officer with headquarters at Afzal Lodge, Tilak Road, Ramkote, Hyderabad-1, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Shanti Khani, Belampalli Division, Singareni Collieries Company Limited in not treating (1) Sarvasri Shaik Lal Mohammed, A. Dominic and B. Jakkulu as Electricians (Category IV) and (2) Sarvasri Shaik Mahaboob, E. Mallesh, P. Laxmanrao and R. Rajam as Electrician helpers (Category II) with effect from fifteenth August, 1967, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?”

[No. 7/10/70-LRIL]

का० आ० 4060:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उल्लेख अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में सिंगारेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डाकघर कोठागुडिम कोलियरीज (आंध्र प्रदेश) से सम्बन्धित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) को धारा 7-क आ० धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० चन्द्रासेखर रेड्डी होंगे, जिसका मुख्यालय अफजल लॉज, निनक रोड, रामकोट, हैदराबाद-1 होगा और उक्त विवाद उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

“क्या शांति खनि, बेलम्पल्ली डिविजन, सिंगारेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धतंत्र की 15 अगस्त, 1967 (1) सर्वश्री शेक लाल मुहम्मद, ए० डोमिनिक और बी० जक्कुलु को इलेक्ट्रिशियन (श्रेणी-4) के रूप में और (2) सर्वश्री शेक महबूब, ई० मल्लेश, पी० लक्ष्मण राव और आर० राजस को इलेक्ट्रिशियन मददगार (श्रेणी-2) के रूप में मानने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?”

[No. 7/10/70-ए० आ०-2]

S.O. 4061.—Whereas, the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Singareni Collieries Company, Limited, Post Office Kothagudem Collieries (Andhra Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of

1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri T. Chandrasekhara Reddy, as Presiding Officer with headquarters at Afzal Lodge, Tilak Road, Ramkote, Hyderabad-1, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, in refusing to count the previous piece-rate services of Sarvashri 1. Dasari Ellalah, 2. Musala Mallaiah, 3. Sunkari Posham, 4. Akudari Rajam, 5. Buddarap Chandraiah, 6. Tombari Lachumaiah, 7. Patha Odeloo, 8. Palle Rayamaloo and 9. Borlakunata Durgaiah, Bank Mazdoors and Sarvashri 1. Durgam Lingalah, 2. Jetti Narsalah and 3. Khajamiyya, Bank Muccadams of Morgans Pit for the purpose of granting service increments and for refixing wages at the time of the implementation of the recommendations of Wage Board, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

[No. 7/12/70-LRIL]

P. C. MISRA, Dy. Secy.

का० प्रा० 4061:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में सिंगारेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डाकघर कोथागूदियम कोलियरीज (आंध्र प्रदेश) से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० चन्द्रसेखर रेड्डी होंग, जिनका मुख्यालय अफ़ज़ल लीज, तिलाक रोड, रामकोट, हैदराबाद—1 होगा और उक्त विवाद उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निदेशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

"क्या सिंगारेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन की, मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिशों का कार्यान्वयन करते समय सेवा बेटन वृद्धियाँ मंजूर करने के प्रयोजन के लिए और मजदूरी के पुनर्निर्धारण के लिए मॉर्गन्स पिट के सर्वश्री 1. दसारी एलिया, 2. मुसला भल्लेइया, 3. संकरी पोशम, 4. अकुदारी राजम, 5. बहुरथ चन्द्रैइया, 6. तोम्बारी लचुमैया, 7. पाथा ओडेलू, 8. पल्ले रायामलू और 9. बोलकुनाता दुर्गाइया, बैंक मजदूरों और सर्वश्री, 1. दुर्गम लिंगैया, 2. जेट्टी नरसैया और 3. खजामिय्या बैंक मुकदमों की पिछला मात्तानुपाती दर वाली सेवाओं की गणना करने, स इन्कार करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार है ।"

[सं० 7/12/70-एल० आर०-2]

पी० सी० मिश्र, अवर सचिव :

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 8th December 1970

S.O. 4062.—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-clause (vi)

of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) declared by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 2345 dated the 27th June, 1970, the banking industry carried on by a banking company as defined in clause (bb) of section 2 of the said Act, to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months from the 29th June, 1970;

And whereas the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act for a further period of six months from the 29th December, 1970.

[F.No.1/85/70-LR.I.].

(अम और रोजगार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4062 यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोक हित में ऐसा अपेक्षित है, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 की खण्ड (क) के उपखण्ड (VI) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के अम, रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (अम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 2345 तारीख 27 जून, 1970 द्वारा, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 2 के खण्ड (खख) में यथा परिभाषित बैंककारी कम्पनी द्वारा चलाए जा रहे बैंककारी उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिये 29 जून, 1970 से छः मास की कालावधि के लिये लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोक हित में उक्त कालावधि का छः मास की और कालावधि के लिये बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है ;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 की खण्ड (क) के उपखण्ड (VI) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिये 29 दिसम्बर, 1970, छः मास की और कालावधि के लिये लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है ।

[संख्या फा० 1/85/70-एल० आर० 1]

S. O. 4063.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 2285, dated the 26th June, 1970, the Central Government had declared the coal industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), for a further period of six months from the 8th July, 1970;

And, whereas the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of the clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act for a further period of six months from the 8th January, 1971.

[No. F. 1/86/70-LRI.]

का० आ० 4063.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, भारत सरकार के श्रम रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 2285, तारीख 26 जून, 1970 द्वारा कोयला उद्योग को औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) के प्रयोजनों के लिये 8 जुलाई, 1970 से छः मास की और कालावधि के लिये लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोक हित में उक्त कालावधि का छः मास की और कालावधि के लिये बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (द) के उपखण्ड (VI) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिये 8 जनवरी, 1971 से छः मास की और कालावधि के लिये लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करनी है ।

[फाइल संख्या 1/86/70-एल० आ० 1]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 10th December 1970

S.O. 4064.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the National and Grindlays Bank Limited and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And Whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of the National and Grindlays Bank Limited, Calcutta, in withdrawing, with effect from the 9th January, 1970, the customary concession of treating the period of absence as on duty in respect of those workmen who, as office-bearers of the National and Grindlays Bank Staff Union, represent its case in proceedings under the Industrial Disputes Act, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

[No.23/113/70-LRIII.]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4064.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उभावद्ध अधिसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में नेशनल एण्ड ग्रिंडलेज बैंक लिमिटेड से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना आवश्यक समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ब) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार एवम् द्वारा

उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या नेशनल एण्ड ग्रिडलेज बैंक लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता के प्रबन्धनत्व की उन कर्मकारों के बारे में, जो नेशनल एण्ड ग्रिडलेज बैंक स्टाफ यूनियन के पदाधिकारियों के रूप में औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम के अधीन कार्यवाहियों में उसके मामले को प्रस्तुत करने है, अनुपस्थिति को कालावधि को ड्यूटी के रूप में मानने की रूढ़ि रियायत को 9 जनवरी, 1970 वापिस लेने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किन अनुतोष के हकदार है ?”

[संख्या 23/113/70-एल० आर० 1]

S.O. 4065.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the National and Grindlays Bank Limited and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi, constituted under section 7A of the said Act

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of National and Grindlays Bank Limited in withdrawing the order made to Shri Hanwant Singh, Cash Peon at the Bank's branch at Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi to perform the duties of a Bill Collector with effect from the 1st July, 1970 and entrusting the same duties to Shri Ram Singh, Chowkidar, was justified? If not to what relief Shri Hanwant Singh is entitled?”

[No.23/117/70-LR-III.]

का० आ० 4065.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में नेशनल एण्ड बैंक लिमिटेड से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण दिल्ली को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या नेशनल एण्ड ग्रिडलेज बैंक लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धनत्व को श्री हनवन्त सिंह आसफ अली रोड, नई दिल्ली में बैंक की शाखा को नकदी चपरासी, को बिल संग्रहकर्ता की ड्यूटी करने के लिए की गई प्रस्थापना को प्रथम जुलाई, 1970 से वापिस लेने और वही ड्यूटी श्री राम सिंह चौकीदार को सौंपने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी ? यदि नहीं, तो श्री हनवन्त सिंह किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ?

[सं० 23/117/70-एल० आर० 3]

S.O. 4066.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the United Commercial Bank and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- “(1) Whether the management of United Commercial Bank, Dehradun was justified in refusing the chance of Dafttry at its Rajpur Branch with effect from the 2nd May, 1969 to Shri Jagdish Prasad, Peon Dehradun Branch? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”
- “(2) Whether the management of United Commercial Bank, Rajpur (Dehradun) was justified in not paying the “B” Class area scales and allowance to Sarvashri B. S. Raja, Clerk-cum-Assistant Cashier, Vinod Kumar, Peon and Jagdish Chand, Guard-cum-Watchman with effect from the 2nd May, 1969? If not, to what relief are these workmen entitled?”

[No. 23/89/70-LR-III.]

का० अा० 4066.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में यूनाइटेड कर्माशियल बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

- (1) “क्या यूनाइटेड कर्माशियल बैंक, देहरादून के प्रबन्धतन्त्र का श्री जगदीश प्रसाद चपरासी देहरादून शाखा, को अपनी राजपुर शाखा में 2 मई, 1969 से दफ्तरी का अवसर देने से इन्कार करना न्यायोचित था ? यदि नहीं तो वह किस अनुरोध का हकदार है”
- (2) “क्या यूनाइटेड कर्माशियल बैंक, राजपुर (देहरादून) के प्रबन्धतन्त्र का सर्व श्री बी० एस० राजा लिपिक एवं सहायक खजांची, विनोद कुमार चपरासी और जगदीश चन्द रक्षक एवं चौकीदार को 2 मई, 1969 से “ख” वर्ग क्षेत्र के वेतनमानों और भत्तों का संशोधन करना न्यायोचित था ? यदि नहीं तो ये कर्मकार किस अनुरोध के हकदार हैं।”

[सं० 23/89/70 एल० आल०-3]

S.O. 4067.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the National and Grindlays Bank Limited, Calcutta and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (11 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- "(1) What percentage of the salary is payable as bonus to the employees of the Bank in respect of the accounting year, 1967, under Payment of Bonus Act, 1965?
- (2) Whether any amount has to be carried forward for being set on under section 15 of the said Act for the accounting year 1967, and if so, what is the amount?

[No. 23/106/70-LR-III.]

का० अा० 4067.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में नेशनल एंड प्रिन्सिपल बैंक लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता के प्रबन्धतन्त्र में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वाछनीय समझती है;

अतः; अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

- "(1) बैंक के कर्मचारियों को लेखा वर्ष 1967 की वाबत बोनस संदाय अधिनियम, 1965 के अधीन बोनस के रूप में वेतन का किन्ना प्रतिशत संदेय है ?
- (2) क्या उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 15 के अधीन लेखा वर्ष 1967 के लिए आगे के लिए रखे जाने के लिए किसी रकम को अग्रणीत किया जाना है, और यदि हा, तो वह रकम क्या है ?

[सं० 23/106/70-एल० आर०-3]

S.O. 4068.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Indian Overseas Bank and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Thiru S. Swamikkannu shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the following four persons employed in the Officers' quarters of the Indian Overseas Bank at Bandra, Bombay are workmen of the Bank? If so, what should be the wages and allowances payable to these persons?"

1. Shri Narasappa.
2. Shri Deepak Bahadur.
3. Shri Jaisingh.
4. Mrs. Sukeda.

[No. 23/90/70/LR.III.]

का० प्रा० 4068.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इस से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में इंडियन ओवरसीज बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री घिस एस० स्वामीयन्नु होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

“क्या इंडियन ओवरसीज बैंक, बान्दरा मुम्बई, के अधिकारियों के क्वार्टरों में नियोजित निम्नलिखित चार व्यक्ति बैंक के कर्मकार हैं ? यदि हाँ, तो इन व्यक्तियों को देय मजदूरी और भत्ते क्या होने चाहिए ।

1. श्री नरमणा
2. श्री दीपक बहादुर
3. श्री जैमिह
4. श्रीमती सुकेदा

[मं० 23/90/70 एल० आर०-3]

S.O. 4069.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Allahabad Bank and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of the Allahabad Bank in terminating the services of Shri Kailash Nath Khare, Clerk of their Allahabad City Branch with effect from the 15th October, 1968 was justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

[No. 23/55/70-LR.III.]

का० प्रा० 4069.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में इलाहाबाद बैंक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

“क्या इलाहाबाद बैंक के प्रबन्धनत्र की प्रती इलाहाबाद नगर शाखा के लिपिक श्री कौशल्याय खरे को सेवाओं को 15 फरवरी, 1968 से समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस अनुसूची का हकदार है?”

[सं० 23/55/70-एन० आर०-2]

S.O. 4070.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the National and Grindlays Bank Limited and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

Now whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of the National and Grindlays Bank Limited, Calcutta in appointing Shri Narayan Chandra Behara, in the sub-staff category, with effect from the 15th May, 1970 was justified, having regard to the existing procedure of giving an opportunity to sons/dependents of retired, disabled and retiring employees of the bank for consideration. If not, what procedure, if any, should be adopted by the Bank to fill the vacancy afresh?

[23/116/70-LR.III.]

का० आ० 4070.—यन: केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में नेशनल एण्ड ग्रिडलेज बैंक लिमिटेड, के प्रबन्धनत्र में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और यन. केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधि-करण, कलकत्ता, को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या बैंक के सेवा निवृत्त, विकलांग और सेवा निवृत्त होने वाले कर्मचारियों के पुत्रों/आश्रितों को अवसर देने पर विचार करने की विद्यमान प्रक्रिया को ध्यान में रखते हुए नेशनल एण्ड ग्रिडलेज बैंक लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता के प्रबन्धनत्र को श्री नारायण चन्द्र बेहरा को 15 मई, 1970 से सब-स्टाफ प्रवर्ग में नियुक्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी? यदि नहीं तो रिक्ति को फिर से भरने के लिए बैंक द्वारा क्या प्रक्रिया, यदि कोई हो, अपनाई जानी चाहिए?”

[सं० 23/116/20/एन० आर० 3]

S.O. 4071.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Punjab National Bank and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of the Punjab National Bank, New Delhi in reverting Shri H. L. Chopra from the post of Teller to that of a clerk with effect from the 20th July, 1969 was justified? If not, to what relief is Shri Chopra entitled?”

[No. 23/74/70-LRIII.]

क्र०अ० 4071.—एत.केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में पंजाब नेशनल बैंक में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और या: केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वाछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, दिल्ली न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

“क्या पंजाब नेशनल बैंक नई दिल्ली के प्रबन्धनक की ओ एच० एल० चोपड़ा को 20 जुलाई, 1969 में टैलर के पद से लिपिक के पद पर पदावतत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी ? यदि नहीं, तो ओ चोपड़ा किस प्रयुक्त के हकदार है ?”

[म० 23/74/70-एन० आर० 1]

S.O. 4072.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, Calcutta and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the Management of the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, Calcutta, by substituting a period of 15 months in place of one year's period for supply of two sets of Cotton Uniforms as per Para 17.1 of the Settlement dated the 19th October, 1966, was justified having regard to the Management's offer for supply of one pair of shoes also every 18 months to all the Sub-staff, on the request of the majority of Sub-Staff?

If not, what should be the procedure to be adopted by the Management in this regard?”

[No. 23/114/70/LRIII.]

का० आ० 4072.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में हांगकांग एंड संघाई बैंकिंग कारपोरेशन कलकत्ता से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है:

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या सब-स्टाफ के बहुमत की प्रार्थना पर पूरे सब-स्टाफ को हर 18 मास में एक जोड़ी जूते भी देने की प्रबन्धतंत्र की प्रस्थापना को ध्यान में रखते हुए हांगकांग एंड संघाई बैंकिंग कारपोरेशन, कलकत्ता के प्रबन्धतंत्र का तारीख 19 अक्टूबर, 1966 वाले समझौते के पैरा 17.1 के अनुसार सूती वर्दी के दो जोड़ों के प्रदाय के लिए एक वर्ष के स्थान पर 15 महीने की कालावधि प्रतिस्थापित करना न्यायोचित था ?

यदि नहीं तो इस बारे में प्रबन्धतंत्र द्वारा अंगीकृत की जाने वाली प्रक्रिया क्या होनी चाहिए ?”

[सं० 23/114/70 एल आर-3]

New Delhi, the 14th December 1970

S.O. 4073.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Central Bank of India, New Delhi and its workmen represented by the Central Bank Workers Union, Delhi;

And, whereas the said employers and workmen have, under sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the dispute to arbitration by arbitration agreement and have forwarded to the Central Government under sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act a copy of the said arbitration agreement;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement which was received by it on the 16th November, 1970.

Agreement

(Under Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

BETWEEN

Name of Parties:

Representing employers.—Shri M. L. Bhalla, Chief Agent, Central Bank of India, Parliament Street, New Delhi.

Representing workmen.—Shri M. L. Razdan, General Secretary, Central Bank Workers Union, 710, Ballimaran, Chandni Chowk, Delhi-6.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following industrial dispute to the arbitration of Shri V. P. Gupta, Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Kanpur.

(1) Specific matters in dispute:

“Whether the management of Central Bank of India is justified in not making Sarvashri Bharat Singh and Ramesh Sharma, Daftries of

Chief Agent's Office, Central Bank of India, New Delhi, clerks? If not to what relief they are entitled?

(ii) Details of parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved:

(a) Chief Agent, Central Bank of India, Parliament Street, New Delhi.

(b) General Secretary, Central Bank Workers Union, 710, Ballimaran, Chandni Chowk, Delhi-6.

(iii) Name of the Union, if any, representing the workmen in question:—

Central Bank Workers Union, 710, Ballimaran, Chandni Chowk, Delhi-6.

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected:
about 60

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute.

Two

We further agree that the majority decisions of the arbitrator shall be binding on us.

The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of two months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

Representing employer.

Sd. M. L. BHALLA,
Chief Agent, Central Bank of
India, New Delhi.

Representing workmen:

Sd. M. L. RAZDAN,
General Secretary,
C.B.W.U. Delhi.

Witnesses:—

1. Sd./- S. K. GAUBA,
Group Accountant,
Chief Agent's Office,
Central Bank of India, New Delhi.
2. Sd./- V. P. BHARGAVA,
Steno to A.L.C.(C).

[No. 24/39/70/LRIII.]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली 14 दिसम्बर, 1970

का० प्र० 4073.—यतः सेंट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया, नई दिल्ली से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उसके कर्मकारों, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व सेंट्रल बैंक वर्कर्स यूनियन, दिल्ली करती है, के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है:

और यतः उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मकारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के अधीन माध्यस्थम् करार द्वारा इस विवाद को माध्यस्थम् के लिए निर्देशित करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यस्थम् करार की एक प्रति उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी है;

अतः, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यस्थम् करार को, जो उसे 16 दिसम्बर, 1970 को प्राप्त हुआ था, एतद्वारा काशित करती है।

करार

प्ररूप ख

(नियम 7 देखिए)

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन करार)

निम्नलिखित के बीच

पक्षकारों के नाम

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले

श्री एम० एल० भट्टा,
मुख्य अभिकर्ता, सेंट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया,
पार्लियामेंट स्ट्रीट, नई दिल्ली

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले

श्री एम० एल० रजदान,
महासचिव, सेंट्रल बैंक वर्कर्स यूनियन,
710, बल्लीमारागन, चादनी चौक, दिल्ली-6

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को एतद्वारा श्री बी० पी० गुप्ता, प्रादेशिक श्रम आयुक्त (सी), कानपुर के माध्यमस्व के लिए निर्देशित करने का वागर किया गया है।

(i) विनिर्दिष्ट विवादग्रत विषय :—

“क्या सेंट्रल बैंक इंडिया के प्रबन्धनत का सर्वश्री भरत सिंह और रमेश शर्मा, सेंट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया के मुख्य अभिकर्ता के कार्यालय के दफ्तरियों, को लिपिक न बनाना न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो वे किस अनुतोष के हकदार है ?

(ii) विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, जिसमे अन्तर्बलित स्थापन या उपक्रम का नाम और पता भी सम्मिलित है :

(क) मुख्य अभिकर्ता, सेंट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया, पार्लियामेंट स्ट्रीट, नई दिल्ली।

(ख) महासचिव, सेंट्रल बैंक वर्कर्स यूनियन, 710, बल्लीमारागन, चादनी चौक, दिल्ली-6

(iii) यदि कोई मंत्र प्रश्नगत कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करता हो तो उसका नाम :—

सेंट्रल बैंक वर्कर्स यूनियन, 710, बल्लीमारागन, चादनी चौक, दिल्ली-6

(iv) प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या :—

लगभग 60

(v) विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या संभाव्यतः प्रभावित होने वाले कर्मकारों की प्राक्कलित संख्या :—
दो

हम यह तरार भी करते हैं कि मध्यस्व के बहुमत विनिश्चय हम पर बाबद्धकर हंगे।

मध्यस्व अपना पंचाट दो मास की कालावधि के भीतर या इन्ने और समय के भीतर, जो हमारे बीच पारस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा दखाया जाय, देगा। यदि पूर्वोक्त कालावधि के भीतर

पंचाट नही दिया जाता तो माध्यस्थ्यम् के लिए निर्देश स्वतः रद्द हो जायेगा और हम नये माध्यस्थ्यम् के लिए बातचीत करने को स्वतंत्र होंगे।

माधवी :—

नियोजक का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले
(एम० एल० भल्ला)

1. (एम० के० गॉबा),
ग्रुप लेखापाल, मुख्य अभियंता का कार्यालय,
सेंट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया, नई दिल्ली

मुख्य अभियंता, सेंट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया,
नई दिल्ली।
कर्मचारियों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले :
(एम० एल० रजदान),

2. (बी० पी० भार्गव)
आणुलिपिक, म० श्र० आ० (सी०)

महासचिव, सै० त्रै० इ० व० यू०, दिल्ली
[संख्या 24/39/70/एल० आर० iii]
(एम० एस० महसूनामन)
अवर सचिव।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 10th December 1970

S.O. 4074.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (3) and (4) of section 5A of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri A. W. DeLima, acting Chairman, Visakhapatnam Port Trust as Chairman and Member of the Visakhapatnam Dock Labour Board vice Shri H. Sambamurti, granted leave with effect from the 25th May, 1970 to the 8th July, 1970, and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. 3582 dated the 28th September, 1968, namely:—

In the said notification, for the expression "Shri H. Sambamurti" in both the places where they occur, the expression "Shri A. W. DeLima" shall be substituted.

[No. 56/2/69-Fac. II/P&D.]

U. MAHABALA RAO, Dy. Secy.

श्रम और रोजगार विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 10 दिसम्बर 1970

का० आ० 4074.—डाक कर्मचार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 5A की उपधारा (3) और (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एनडूआर श्री ए० डब्ल्यू० डेलीमा, कार्यकारी अध्यक्ष, विशाखापटनम पोर्टन ट्रस्ट को, श्री एच० संस्वामूर्ति के स्थान पर, दिनांक 25 मई, 1970 से 8 जुलाई, 1970 तक छुट्टी दे गई है, विशाखापटनम के डाक श्रम बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष और सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है और भारत सरकार के श्रम रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) का अधिसूचना सं० 3582 तारीख 28 सितम्बर, 1968 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "श्री ए० ड० संस्वामूर्ति" पद अभिव्यक्ति के स्थान पर दोनों जगह जहाँ वे आती हैं "श्री ए० ड० डब्ल्यू० डेलीमा" पद अभिव्यक्ति प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी।

(सं० 56/2/69-फे-क० II/रो० एण्ड डी०)

उ० माहबाला राव, उप सचिव।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 17th December 1970

S.O. 4075.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 3), Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Junkundar Colliery belonging to Messrs D. Mondal and Company, Post Office Chirkunda, District Dhanbad, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 30th November, 1970.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 3) AT DHANBAD.

REFERENCE No. 15 of 1970

PRESENT:

Shri Sachidanand Sinha, M.A.M.L., Presiding Officer.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Junkundar Colliery

Vs.

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

For employers—Sri A. K. Mondal, Agent.

For workmen—Sri S. Dasgupta, Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

STATE: Bihar.

Dhanbad, dated the 19th of November, 1970

AWARD

1. The Central Government, being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Junkundar Colliery belonging to Messrs D. Mondal and Company, Post Office Chirkunda, District Dhanbad and their workmen by its order No. 2/9/70-LR11 dated the 25th of February, 1970 referred under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication the dispute in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule annexed thereto. The Schedule is extracted below:—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Junkundar Colliery belonging to Messrs D. Mondal and Company Post Office Chirkunda, District Dhanbad, in stopping Shri Salik Yadav, Watchman, from work with effect from the 28th August, 1969 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The parties have filed their written statements but it is unnecessary to state the respective cases of the parties because the dispute has been amicably settled. The parties have filed a joint petition of compromise which has been verified by Sri S. Das Gupta, Secretary of the Union on behalf of the workmen and by Sri S. Mondal on behalf of D. Mondal & Co.

3. According to the terms of the memorandum of settlement it has been agreed that Shri Salik Yadav, the concerned workman shall be reinstated in his original job as Guard with continuity of service and he will be paid an amount of Rs. 500 (Rupees five hundred) in full and final settlement of all his dues from the management for the period of his unemployment from 19th July, 1969 to 9th May, 1970. The management has agreed to pay the workman concerned, who has already been taken back in employment since 10th May, 1970, all the difference in wages and benefits due to him from 10th May, 1970 to the date of this settlement by 31st December, 1970.

4. The terms of settlement are fair and reasonable and the same are accepted. Accordingly an award is made in terms of the memorandum of settlement (annexure 'A'), a copy of which is enclosed with the award.

5. It may now be submitted to the Central Government under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd.) SACHIDANAND SINHA,
Presiding Officer.

ANNEXURE 'A'

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 3), DHANBAD.

REFERENCE NO. 15 OF 1970

Employers in relation to Junkundar Colliery, P.O. Chirkunda, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen, represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

The Joint petition on behalf of the management and the workmen referred to above beg most humbly to state as under:—

(1) That the above matter has been pending before this Hon'ble Tribunal for nearly a year.

(2) That both the parties to the reference have settled the dispute on the following terms and conditions:—

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

(a) It is agreed that Shri Salikh Yadav shall be reinstated in his original job as Guard with continuity of service.

(b) It is agreed that the workman concerned shall be paid an amount of Rs. 500 (Rupees five hundred) in full and final settlement of all his dues from the management for the period of his unemployment from 19th July, 1969 to 9th May, 1970.

(c) The management agrees to pay the workman concerned, who has already been taken back in employment since 10th May 1970, all the difference in wages and benefits due to him from 10th May, 1970 to the date of this settlement by 31st December, 1970.

It is, therefore, humbly prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to accept the aforesaid settlement as a fair settlement and pass an award in terms thereof.

And for this the petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray.

For the employers:

S. MONDAL,
For D. Mondal & Co.,
Proprietor.

L.T.I. of SALIK JADAV.

Dated, 17th November, 1970.

For the Workmen:

S. DAS GUPTA,
Secretary,
Colliery Mazdoor Sangh

[No. 2/9/70-LR.II.]

S.O. 4076.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jhunkundar Colliery, Post Office Nirshachatti, Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 3rd December, 1970.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri Nandagiri Venkata Rao, Presiding Officer.

REFERENCE NO. 10 OF 1970.

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10 (1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Jhunkundar Colliery, Post Office Nirshachatti, Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the employers:

Shri S. S. MUKHERJEE, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen

SHRI S. DASGUPTA, Advocate

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

Dhanbad 26th November, 1970

AWARD

The Central Government, being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Jhunkundar Colliery, Post Office Nirshachatti, Dhanbad and their workmen, by its order No. 2/28/70-LR.II dated 7th October, 1970 referred to this Tribunal under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication the dispute in respect of the matters specified in the schedule annexed thereto. The schedule is extracted below:—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Jhunkundar Colliery, Post Office Nirshachatti, Dhanbad in transferring Sarvashri Lachman Yadav, Munarik Ram and Suneshwar Choudhury, Guards with effect from the 19th July, 1969 to Shampur Badjna Colliery was justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

2. On 24th November, 1970 parties appeared before this Tribunal on their own accord and filed a compromise memo. The employers were represented by Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate and the workmen by Shri S. Dasgupta, Advocate. The compromise memo was duly verified. I consider the terms of compromise as beneficial to the affected workmen and in the interest of maintaining industrial peace. The compromise is accepted. The award is made in terms of the compromise and submitted under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The compromise memo is made part of the Award.

N. VENKATA RAO, Presiding Officer.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL, TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

REFERENCE, 10 OF 1970

(Vide Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) Order No. 2/28/70-LR.II dated 7th October, 1970).

Employers in relation to Junkundar Colliery, P.O. Chirkunda, Dist. Dhanbad

AND

Their workmen, represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

The Joint Petition on behalf of the management and the workmen referred to above begs most humbly to state as under:—

(1) That the above matter has been pending before this Hon'ble Tribunal since October, 1970.

(2) That both the parties to the reference have settled the dispute on the following terms and conditions:—

Terms of Settlement

1. It is agreed that the services of S/Shri Lachman Yadav, Munarik Ram and Suneshwar Choudhury, Guards shall be retained as Guards at Junkundar Colliery with continuity of service from their original dates of appointments and without any alterations to their service conditions and that the orders of transfer issued to them shall be cancelled.

2. It is agreed that all the three concerned workmen shall be paid an amount of Rs. 500 (Rupees five hundred) each in full and final settlement of all their dues from the employers for the period of their unemployment from 19th July 1969 to 9th May 1970.

3. The management agreed to pay the workmen, concerned all of whom have already been taken back in employment, since 10th May 1970, all the difference

in wages and benefits due to them from 10th May 1970 to the date of this settlement, by the 31st December, 1970 at the latest.

It is, therefore, prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to accept the aforesaid settlement as fair settlement and pass an award in terms thereof.

And for this the petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray.

For the employers:

S. MONDAL, For D. MONDOL & Co., Proprietor

For the workmen:

S. DAS GUPTA, Secy.

Colliery Mazdoor Sangh.

Dated: 17th November, 1970.

[No. 2/28/70-LR.II.]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 2nd December 1970

S.O. 4077.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of East Jambad Colliery (Messrs Amalgamated Jambad Syndicate Company Private Limited), Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of East Jambad Colliery (Messrs Amalgamated Jambad Syndicate Private Limited), Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan are justified in not paying Variable Dearness Allowance at the rate of Rs. 1.53 per day with effect from the 1st April, 1970 in accordance with the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry as accepted by the Government of India in their Resolution No. WB-18(5)/66, Dated the 21st July, 1967? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

[No. 6/74/70-LR.II.]

(भ्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 दिसम्बर, 1970

का०प्र० 4077.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में ईस्ट जामबद कोलियरी (मसर्स अमलग-जामबाद सिन्डीकेट कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड), डाकघर कजोरग्राम, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्म-कारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, भ्रम, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या ईस्ट जामबद कोलियरी मैसर्ज अमलगेमेटेड जामबद सिन्डिकेट (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, डाकघर काजोराग्राम, जिला बर्दवान का कोयला खान उद्योग के लिए केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिशों के अनुसार 1-4-70 से 1.53 रु० प्रतिदिन की दर से बी०डी०ए० की अदायगी, जिसे भारत सरकार ने अपने संकल्प सं० डब्ल्यू०बी-16(5)/66, तारीख 21-7-69 द्वारा स्वीकार किया है, न्यायोचित है यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

[सं० 6/74/70-एल०आर०-2]

S.O. 4078.—Whereas by an order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. 6/75/70-LRIL, dated the 2nd December, 1970 an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of South Jambad Colliery (Messrs South Jambad Coal Company Private Limited), Post Office Kajoram, District Burdwan and their workmen had been referred to the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby prohibits the continuance of the strike in existence in the said colliery in connection with the said dispute.

[No. 6/75/70-LRIL.]

का०आ० 4078.—यतः भारत सरकार के श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) के आदेश सं० 6/75/70-एल०आर०-2, तारीख 2-12-70 द्वारा साउथ जामबद कोलियरी (मैसर्ज साउथ जामबद कोल कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, डाकघर काजोराग्राम, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद को औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित कर दिया गया है।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त कोयला खान में उक्त विवाद के संबंध में विद्यमान हड़ताल के जारी रखने का प्रतिषेध करती है।

(सं० 6/75/70-एल० आर०-2)

S.O. 4079.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Jambad Colliery (Messrs North Adjai Coal Company Private Limited), Post Office Kajoram, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Jambad Colliery (Messrs North Adjai Coal Company Private Limited), Post Office Kajoram, District Burdwan are justified in not paying Variable Dearness Allowance at the rate of Rs. 1.53 per day with effect from the 1st April, 1970 in accordance with the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry as accepted by the Government of India in their Resolution No. WB-16(5)/66, dated the 21st July, 1967? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?”

[No. 6/76/70-LRIL.]

KARNAIL SINGH, Under Secy.

का०आ० 4079.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में जाम गद कोलियरी (मैसर्ज नार्थ अरजे कोल कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड), डाकघर काजौराग्राम, जिला वर्दवान के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या जाम गद कोलियरी (मैसर्ज नार्थ अरजे कोल प्राइवेट लिमिटेड), डाकघर काजौराग्राम जिला वर्दवान के प्रबन्धतंत्र का केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिशों के अनुसार 1-4-70 से, 1. 53 रु० प्रतिदिन की दर से बी०डी०ए० की अदायगी न करना, जैसा कि भारत सरकार ने अपने संकल्प सं० ड ट्यू बी-16(5)/66, तारीख 21-7-69 द्वारा स्वीकार किया है, न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किम अनुतोष के हकदार है?”

[सं० 6/76/70-एल०आर०-2]

करनैल सिंह, अवर सचिव।

(Department of Rehabilitation)

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

New Delhi, the 21st November 1970

S O. 4080.—In exercise of the powers conferred on the Chief Settlement Commissioner by Section 34(2) of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954) he hereby delegates to Shri J. S. Quami, P.C.S., Settlement Officer (Sales) in the Rehabilitation Department of the Punjab State exercising the powers of Settlement Commissioner, his powers under sections 23, 24 and 28 of the said Act for the purpose of passing necessary orders under these sections in respect of agricultural lands and shops in any rural area including houses, cattle sheds and vacant sites forming parts of the compensation pool.

[No. 3(2)/LR/69.]

(पुनर्वास विभाग)

(मुख्य बन्दीवस्त आयुक्त का कार्यालय)

नई दिल्ली, 21 नवम्बर, 1970

का० आ० 4080.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 44) का धारा 34(2) द्वारा मुख्य बन्दीवस्त आयुक्त को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, वे इसके द्वारा बन्दीवस्त की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने वाले पंजाब सरकार के पुनर्वास विभाग में बन्दीवस्त अधिकारी (बिक्री) श्री जे० ए० ए० सी० ए० ए० को उक्त अधिनियम की 23, 24 तथा 28 धाराओं के अन्तर्गत मुद्रास्वत माल के प्रयोग के रूप में कृषि भूमि और देहानी क्षेत्र को

दुकानें जिसमें मकान, पशुशालाएं तथा खाली स्थान भी शामिल हैं, उक्त धाराओं के अन्तर्गत आवश्यक आदेश देने के लिए अपने अधिकार सौंपते हैं।

[सं० 3(2)/एल० आर०/69]

S.O. 4081.—In exercise of the powers conferred on the Chief Settlement Commissioner by Section 34(2) of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954) he hereby delegates to Shri R. S. Dass, Assistant Chief Settlement Commissioner in the Rehabilitation Department of the Punjab State exercising the powers of Settlement Commissioner, his powers under sections 23, 24 and 28 of the said Act for the purpose of passing necessary orders under these sections in respect of urban evacuee properties including urban agricultural lands forming part of the compensation pool.

[No. 3(2)/C&R-69.]

W. G. PATHAK, Chief Settlement Commissioner.

का० प्रा० 4081.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 34 (2) द्वारा मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए वे इसके द्वारा बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने वाले पंजाब सरकार के पुनर्वास विभाग में सहायक मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त श्री आर० एस० दास, को उक्त अधिनियम की 23, 24 तथा 28 धाराओं के अन्तर्गत मुआवजा भंडार के अंश के रूप में शहरी निष्क्रान्त सम्पत्तियों पर, जिनमें शहरी कृषि भूमि भी शामिल है, उक्त धाराओं के अन्तर्गत आवश्यक आदेश देने के लिए अपने अधिकार सौंपते हैं।

[सं० 3(2)/सी० आर० 69]

वा० ग० पाठक,

मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त।

THE ALIGARH

S.O. 4082.—

GENERAL REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

Expenditure	Amount			
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
GENERAL FUND				
1. General Administration—				
Salaries	10,14,343	29		
Allowances	5,69,891	00		
Provident Fund Contribution	36,038	62		
Other Charges	16,44,325	01		
			32,91,597	92
2. Faculties—				
Salaries—				
Teaching Staff	17,71,578	82		
Non-Teaching Staff	4,09,451	83		
Allowances—				
Teaching Staff	2,47,954	20		
Non-Teaching Staff	1,88,290	03		
Provident Fund Contribution—				
Teaching Staff	1,23,081	84		
Non-Teaching Staff	20,202	17		
Other Charges	2,93,097	21		
			30,53,656	10
3. University Colleges—				
Salaries—				
Teaching Staff	6,76,902	12		
Non-Teaching Staff	3,52,792	15		
Allowances—				
Teaching Staff	1,14,867	74		
Non-Teaching Staff	1,52,748	68		
Provident Fund Contribution—				
Teaching Staff	47,983	44		
Non-Teaching Staff	18,656	80		
Other Charges	2,81,749	54		
			16,45,700	47
4. University Schools—				
Salaries—				
Teaching Staff	3,02,067	01		
Non-Teaching Staff	72,281	88		
Allowances—				
Teaching Staff	82,183	60		
Non-Teaching Staff	48,125	09		
Provident Fund Contribution—				
Teaching Staff	19,222	13		
Non-Teaching Staff	2,189	21		
Other Charges	48,871	49		
			5,74,490	41

MUSLIM UNIVERSITY**ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR 1965-66**

Income	Amount	
	Rs. P.	Rs. P.
(CURRENT EXPENSES)		
1. Grants-In-aid		
Central Government Grants	86,95,680.00	
U.P. Government Grants	2,17,856.00	
Former Ruling States Grants	6,856.00	
		89,20,392.00
2. Fees from Students—		
Tuition Fee	6,63,007.07	
Admission Fee	26,716.17	
Hostel Fee	1,73,817.64	
Examination and Admission Test Fee	2,71,010.17	
Registration and Enrolment Fee	28,954.00	
Medical Fee	42,177.72	
Other Fees	53,972.75	
		12,59,655.52
3. Other Income—		
Interest on Investment	1,57,783.42	
Rents	1,31,777.72	
Agriculture Income	1,32,162.03	
Transfer from Depreciation Fund	1,10,796.00	
Other Miscellaneous Income	1,70,686.87	
		70,3,206.04

Expenditure				Amount			
				Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
5. University Institutions—							
Salaries—							
Teaching Staff	.	.	.	29,332	33		
Non-Teaching Staff	.	.	.	44,212	54		
Allowances—							
Teaching Staff	.	.	.	3,240	00		
Non-Teaching Staff	.	.	.	16,305	97		
Provident Fund Contribution—							
Teaching Staff	.	.	.	2,302	13		
Non-Teaching Staff	.	.	.	1,650	44		
Other Charges	.	.	.	24,018	25		
						1,21,061	66
6. Other Departments—							
Salaries—							
Teaching Staff	.	.	.	88,840	31		
Non-Teaching Staff	.	.	.	5,68,589	81		
Allowances—							
Teaching Staff	.	.	.	21,638	17		
Non-Teaching Staff	.	.	.	2,50,548	95		
Provident Fund Contribution—							
Teaching Staff	.	.	.	4,852	84		
Non-Teaching Staff	.	.	.	27,120	68		
Other Charges	.	.	.	8,33,563	89		
						17,95,154	65
Total—Expenditure						1,04,82,111	21
Revenue Surplus						4,01,142	35
TOTAL						1,08,83,253	56

DEVELOPMENT GRANT ACCOUNT**1. Faculty of Arts—**

Salaries—							
Teaching Staff	.	.	.	1,49,890	65		
Non-Teaching Staff	.	.	.	6,095	72		
Allowances—							
Teaching Staff	.	.	.	24,804	46		
Non-Teaching Staff	.	.	.	2,825	86		
Provident Fund Contribution—							
Teaching Staff	.	.	.	4,710	85		
Non-Teaching Staff	.	.	.	259	20		
Other Charges	.	.	.	27,302	87		
						2,15,889	61

Income		Amount	
		Rs.	P.
		Rs.	P.
TOTAL—INCOME		1,08,83,253·56	
(PLAN EXPENDITURE)			
1. Grants-in-aid from U.G.C.—			
Faculty of Arts		1,77,637·15	
Faculty of Science		2,01,016·39	
Faculty of Commerce		15,000·00	
Faculty of Law		15,000·00	
Faculty of Theology		8,000·00	
Faculty of Engineering and Technology		22,73,946·00	
Faculty of Medicine		10,00,000·00	
Other Departments and Institutions		5,29,454·56	
		42,20,054·10	

Expenditure						Amount			
						Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
2. Faculty of Science—									
Salaries—									
Teaching Staff	1,10,787	18		
Non-Teaching Staff	6,836	74		
Allowances—									
Teaching Staff	26,289	09		
Non-Teaching Staff	3,022	91		
Provident Fund Contribution—									
Teaching Staff	3,677	83		
Non-Teaching Staff	266	25		
Other Charges	1,13,068	59		
								2,63,948	59
3. Faculty of Commerce—									
Salaries—									
Teaching Staff	29,446	84		
Non-Teaching Staff			
Allowances—									
Teaching Staff	3,070	90		
Non-Teaching Staff			
Provident Fund Contribution—									
Teaching Staff	1,044	43		
Non-Teaching Staff			
Other Charges			
								33,562	17
4 Faculty of Law—									
Salaries—									
Teaching Staff	24,925	94		
Allowances—									
Teaching Staff	4,115	88		
Provident Fund Contribution—									
Teaching Staff	1,594	00		
Other Charges	499	80		
								31 135	62
5. Faculty of Theology—									
Salaries—									
Teaching Staff	5,329	00		
Allowances—									
Teaching Staff	1,700	33		
Provident Fund Contribution—									
Teaching Staff	214	92		
								7,244	25

Income	Amount	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
2. Fees from Students—					
Faculty of Engineering and Technology . . .	96,479·61				
Faculty of Medicine . . .	62,234·84				
				1,58,714·45	

Expenditure						Amount		
						Rs.	P.	Rs. P.
6. Faculty of Engineering and Technology—								
Salaries—								
Teaching Staff	7,37,455	47	
Non-Teaching Staff	1,87,352	41	
Allowances—								
Teaching Staff	1,25,684	94	
Non-Teaching Staff	86,677	47	
Provident Fund Contribution—								
Teaching Staff	24,000	19	
Non-Teaching Staff	11,240	86	
Other Charges	2,16,617	07	
7. Faculty of Medicine—								13,89,028.41
Salaries—								
Teaching Staff	3,57,628	01	
Non-Teaching Staff	2,34,530	41	
Allowances—								
Teaching Staff	1,77,316	71	
Non-Teaching Staff	1,00,363	93	
Provident Fund Contribution—								
Teaching Staff	11,432	52	
Non-Teaching Staff	9,390	16	
Other Charges	2,50,655	82	
								11,41,317.56
8. Other Departments—								
Salaries—								
Teaching Staff	89,938	68	
Non-Teaching Staff	19,849	96	
Allowances—								
Teaching Staff	34,713	58	
Non-Teaching Staff	8,045	64	
Provident Fund Contribution—								
Teaching Staff	4,680	13	
Non-Teaching Staff	426	73	
Other Charges	4,16,946	04	
								5,74,600.76
TOTAL—EXPENDITURE								36,56,726.97
Transferred to unexpended Balances								7,22,041.58
TOTAL								43,78,768.55
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT								
1. Electricity Department—								
Salaries	93,917	39	
Allowances	22,043	74	
Provident Fund Contribution	3,894	06	
Other Charges	3,22,825	92	
								4,42,681.11

Expenditure	Amount			
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
2. M. U. Hospital Drug Store—				
Salaries	5,678	73		
Allowances	1,287	50		
Provident Fund Contribution	133	38		
Other Charges	24,990	57		
				32,090·18
Total—Expenditure				4,74,771·29
Surplus—M. U. Hospital Drug Store				784·59
				4,75,555,88
TOTAL				

Income	Amount
PLAN EXPENDITURE— <i>Consolid.</i>	Rs. R

..

..

Total—Income	43,78,768·55
Transferred to unexpended Balances	
TOTAL	43,78,768·55

(COMMERCIAL DEPARTMENTS)

1. Electricity Department—

Sale of Electricity	3,10,695·09	
Miscellaneous	65,075·20	
	3,75,770·29	

Income	Amount
	Rs. P.
2. M. U. Hospital Drug Store—	
Sale of Medicines	32,874·77
Total—Income	4,08,645·06
Deficit—Electricity Deptt.	66,910·82
TOTAL	4,75,555·88

BALANCE SHEET AS AT

Liabilities	Amount	
	Rs. P.	Rs. P.
Permanent Endowment—		
Capitalised Value of Investment made by the University under Section 7 of the Aligarh Muslim University Act, XL, of 1920		30,00,000·00
Permanent Reserve Fund—		
H.E. Nazim's Donation	10,05,831·25	
Prince of Wales Science School Account	2,78,578·34	
Sir Syed Ahmad Memorial Fund	1,39,026·54	
Capital of M.A.O. College	55,332·55	
Transfers from—		
Floating Reserve Fund	4,51,147·08	
Current Expenses Fund	70,084·24	
		20,00,000·00
Special Floating Reserve Fund—		
<i>Grants from former Ruling States—</i>		
Bhopal Grant for Science College	2,48,479·44	
H.H. the Ruler of Bhopal Grant for Flying Club	50,000·00	
Bahawalpur State Grant for General Buildings	65,000·00	
Mahmudabad Grant for General Buildings	38,000·00	
<i>U.G.C. Grants—</i>		
For purchase of Evacuee Property	1,54,000·00	
For purchase of "Kashana"	35,000·00	
Donations—		
Donation for Art Gallery by late Prof. Moinuddin	21,375·82	
Interest on Moinuddin's Art Gallery	2,400·00	
Cost of Waqf House of Mr. Naziruddin Khan of Shahjahanpur	1,600·00	
General Buildings by Hajee Mohd. Zahoor Mohd. Saeed	500·00	
Auchinleck Memorial Fund	99,753·37	
Polytechnic Account	1,50,415·28	
Sunni Theology	38·00	
Sunni Theology Books	2,634·24	
Islamic Studies	1,500·00	
Islamic Studies Books	8,702·00	
Hindi and Sanskrit Books	100·00	
Blind School	693·46	
Political Science Books	2,209·12	
Employees Deposits for Purchase of Land—		
Mr. Jan Mohd. Khan	674·00	
Mr. Inayatullah Kureshy	2,234·00	
Mr. Niaz Ahmad Siddiqi	678·00	
Miscellaneous receipts	52,371·25	
		9,38,357·98

31st MARCH, 1966

Assets		Amount			
		Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Investments—					
Permanent Endowment		30,00,000	00		
Permanent Reserve Fund		18,86,122	13		
Special Floating Reserve Fund		4,21,498	21		
Trust Fund		2,05,981	77		
Depreciation Fund		10,99,146	08		
College of Engineering and Technology Fund		2,49,375	00		
Current Expenses Fund		95,849	02		
Deposit Account		4,53,956	26		
Provident Fund Account		30,61,293	50		
Medical College Fund		7,63,751	31		
Wali Mohd. Waqf Alal Aulad		1,00,000	00		
				1,13,36,973	28
Fixed Deposits—					
Saifi Trust Account		27,094	90		
Sirohi Waqf Account		1,68,420	00		
Deposit Account		1,60,000	00		
Provident Fund Account		11,00,000	00		
				14,55,514	90
Lands and Buildings—					
Permanent Reserve Fund		1,11,937	06		
Special Floating Reserve Fund		4,71,536	99		
Floating Reserve Fund		2,13,480	28		
Trust Fund		76,945	52		
Building Fund		1,22,01,139	10		
Engineering College Fund		9,42,587	50		
Current Expenses Fund		20,871	87		
Development Grant Account		1,52,28,694	63		
Deposit Account (Ford Foundation Fund)		17,72,027	57		
Medical College Fund		72,88,207	69		
				3,83,27,428	21
Books—Development Grant Account					
				17,01,634	73
Equipment—Development Grant Account					
				66,80,179	83
Furniture—Development Grant Account					
				10,00,918	79
Loans and Advances—					
Special Floating Reserve Fund		8,000	00		
College of Engineering and Technology Fund		497	45		
Current Expenses Fund		149	09		
Development Grant Account		8,000	00		
Deposit Account		8,032	84		
Provident Fund Account		2,83,474	45		
				3,08,153	83

Liabilities	Amount			
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Floating Reserve Fund—				
Capitalised Funds	3,49,959	50		
Donations—				
Mr. Syed Jawad Ali	5,000	00		
Mr. Syed Nawab Ali	1,000	00		
Mr. Wali Mohd. Swalch Bhai	1,000	00		
Amir Khusro Fund	434	11		
Qanoon Masoodi Fund	3,436	18		
For Compilation of Muslim University History	300	00		
			3,61,129	79
Trust Fund—				
General Scholarship Fund	1,07,773	36		
Arabic Scholarship Fund	64,899	77		
Poor Students' Fund	2,000	00		
Miscellaneous Endowments—				
Prizes and Medals	48,947	99		
Sir Shah Mohd. Sulaiman Gold Medal	1,000	00		
Lady. Ali Shah Gold Medal	1,000	00		
Col. Haider Khan Gold Medal	1,005	50		
Saifi Gold Medal	11,000	00		
Sir Abdur Rauf Scholarship for Engineering Students	50,000	00		
Sheikh Azizullah Scholarship	3,338	75		
Z.A.C. Bonds donated by Nawab Sahib of Chattari for Tamgai Saudi	2,000	00		
Sir William Marris Scholarship	2,055	37		
Saifi Trust Fund	24,700	00		
Sirohi Waqf Fund	1,75,000	00		
Sirohi Waqf Interest Account	5,379	94		
Dr. Radha Krishnan Scholarship				
Interest and Rent Account	43,538	48		
Prof. Hameeduddin Khan's Waqf	3,494	50		
			5,47,133	66
Depreciation Fund			13,03,577	49
Building Fund			1,22,06,608	66
College of Engineering & Technology Fund			11,71,247	04
Miscellaneous Credit Balances—				
Current Expenses Fund—				
Reserve Fund—Girls High School	19,000	00		
Women's College Fund	65,098	72		
Women's College Security Deposit Account	9,404	19		
Provident Fund Recoveries Suspense	22,285	09		

Assets	Amount	
	Rs.	P.
Inter-Fund Advances—		
From General Fund to—		
Development Grant Account	1,84,927	07
Medical College Fund	2,67,063	52
Provident Fund Account	50	00
From Deposit Account to—		
General Fund	6,08,362	14
Development Grant Account	2,17,500	00
From Medical College Fund to Deposit—		
Account	20,000	00
From Provident Fund Account to—		
Development Grant Account	2,08,000	00
Medical College Fund	2,30,000	00
From Development Grant Account to Medical College Fund	50,000	00
Permanent Advances		17,85,902.73 28,211.06
Miscellaneous Debit Balances—		
<i>Current Expenses Fund:—</i>		
Advances on Account	1,93,968	58
Advances to Tibbiya College Dawakhana	8,713	70
Outstanding dues from Students	1,89,026	23
Stock Suspense Account	4,22,459	84
Coal Suspense Account	75,772	47
Accumulated deficit of the University to the end of 1955-56	13,76,640	60
Accumulated deficit of Tibbiya College to the end of 1952-53	1,91,951	31
Accumulated deficit of Engineering College to the end of 1952-53	2,02,401	89
Loan to M. U. Girls High School	4,000	00
Loan to General Education for publication	7,660	71
Security Deposit of Agriculture with Hydel Division, Roorkee	2,500	00
Suspense Accounts	1,70,493	38
Salaries Cheques	26,805	49
Unclassified payments made by the Bank	1,32,287	72
Revenue and Expenditure Account .		
	Rs.	P.
Deficit as on 31-3-65	9,18,154	17
Less Surplus during the year	4,01,142	35
		5,17,011.82
		35,21,695.76
<i>Development Grant Account—</i>		
Payment made on Hospital Account	5,723	12
Recoveries Suspense Account	19,306	02
Revenue and Expenditure Account:		
	Rs.	P.
Amount overspent as on 31-3-65	8,89,880	10
Amount unspent during the year	7,22,041	58
		1,67,838.52
		1,92,867.66

Liabilities	Amount			
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Miscellaneous Credit Balances—concl'd.				
<i>Current Expenses Fund—concl'd.</i>				
Agriculture College Fund	8,194	09		
Students Aid Fund	59,592	80		
Library Deposit Account	2,418	14		
<i>Boys/Girls Fund:</i>				
City High School	18,271	71		
City Branch School	748	33		
Girls High School	20,301	89		
Foreign Students' Welfare Fund	279	00		
Income Tax Account	7,518	54		
Unclassified credits afforded by the Bank	45,729	80		
Recoveries Suspense	55,723	58		
<i>Advances from—</i>				
Various Halls	83,000	00		
Scholarship Account	85,000	00		
Boarding House Account	1,14,864	22		
Deposit Account	6,08,362	14		
Other Miscellaneous Accounts	51,090	57		
			12,76,882	81
Total—General Fund			2,28,04,937	43
Development Grant Account—				
Capital Grants from the University Grants Commission	2,34,39,085	95		
Deposit account of the grant received from Council of Scientific and Industrial Research	53,493	36		
Deposit account of the grant received from the Council of Agriculture Research	2,712	38		
Deposit account of the grant received for Scholarships and Fellowships—				
University Grants Commission—				
Senior/Junior Research Fellowship	30,428	32		
Post-Graduate Research in Science and Humanities	6,304	50		
Government of India Grant—				
Research Training Scholarship	7,872	93		
U.P. Government Grant	30,441	55		
Suspense Account	24,981	72		
Liabilities to General Fund on account of Agriculture Farm	1,53,654	07		
Loan to General Education Centre	3,000	00		
<i>Advances from—</i>				
General Fund	1,84,927	07		
Provident Fund	2,08,000	00		
Deposit Account	2,17,500	00		
			2,43,62,401	85

Assets		Amount	
		Rs.	P.
Miscellaneous Debit Balances—concl'd.			
<i>Deposit Account—</i>			
Blind School Revenue Account		996	22
Old Outstanding Account		15,912	54
Deposit account of the grant received from P.L. 480 for Plantation in U.P.		6,161	66
Electricity Department Income and Expenditure Account:			
	Rs.	P.	
Surplus as on 31-3-65	22,562	50	
Deficit during the year	66,910	82	
	<u>44,348</u>		32
			67,418
Cash Balances—			
General Fund (with State Bank of India, Karachi)	731	03	
Deposit Account	99,500	92	
Provident Fund	5,21,777	85	
Dr. Wali Mohd. Waqf Alal Aulad	3,141	43	
	<u>6,25,151</u>		23

Liabilities	Amount		
	Rs. P. Rs. P.		
Deposit Account—			
Ford Foundation Grant	17,72,027.57		
Duty Society and R. D. H. Account	48,650.96		
Duty Society Building Account	8,600.00		
M. U. Students' Union Account	55,000.00		
Vice-Chancellor's Fund	27,408.99		
Vice-Chancellor's Relief Fund	69.00		
Cycle Registration Account	4,144.13		
Film Club Account	388.71		
N.C.C. Account	130.79		
Poor Students' Fund	221.36		
Personal Deposits	6,925.84		
Old Boys' Association Account	2.00		
Mosque Fund	2,599.83		
Brick Kiln Suspense Account	8,116.78		
Security Deposits—			
Building Contractors	1,738,977.58		
Cashiers	6,648.53		
Vendors	1,637.35		
Compounders	150.00		
Electricity Consumers	4,600.34		
Hobbies Workshop Amenities Fund	3,683.99		
Deposit account of the grant from the International Council for the study of Afro-Asian Geography	27,014.91		
Administrative and Ministerial Staff Association Account	1,884.45		
Interest on Investments Account	2,14,982.09		
Fikro Nazar Magazine Account	2,177.43		
Tibbiya College Scholarship Fund	19,479.58		
World University Service	2,788.04		
Tennis Club Account	120.00		
Union Magazine Fee Account	446.15		
Vice-Chancellor's Flood Relief Fund	672.50		
Deposit account of the grant received from J.K. Govt. for creation of Fellowship in Hindi and Urdu	17,380.82		
Unexpended Balances Account—			
J. K. Govt. grant for renovation of Sir Syed House	40,429.04		
J. K. Govt. grant for purchase of equipment for N.R.S.C.	50.61		
Tarwala Bungalow Mosque Account	3,038.31		
Donat on from Prime Minister of Kuwait	99,940.00		
House Building Loans from Provident Fund Account	11,820.73		
Agriculture Farm Revenue and Expenditure Account	138.51		
Interest on Ford Foundation Investments	5,171.36		
Deposit account of the grant from J. K. Government for construction of Kashmir House	37,881.74		
Khalida Umaruddin Scholarship Account	10,000.00		
Khalid Rashid Scholarship Account	277.10		
Salaries, cheques	1,696.96		
Advances from Medical College Fund	20,000.00		
Ford Foundation Income and Expenditure Account	1,59,074.74		
Other Miscellaneous Accounts	16,399.28		
Surplus—M. U. Drug Store	3,950.37		
		33,86,798.47	

Liabilities		Amount			
		Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Provident Fund Account—					
Medical College Fund—					
Donations from—					
States		16,05,000	00		
Individuals		22,99,649	16		
His Majesty the King of Saud		10,00,000	00		
Rusi Mistry of Bombay		39,680	13		
Miss E. G. Everest, England		13,722	90		
Advances from—					
General Fund		2,42,063	52		
Provident Fund		2,30,000	00		
Development Grant Account		50,000	00		
Medical Study Loans		30,127	08		
Contractors, outstanding dues		1,66,779	20		
Liabilities paid from—					
General Fund		17,574	84		
Development Grant Account		1,96,594	44		
Material at site Account		2,17,030	70		
Contractors, Security Deposits		3,87,305	09		
Recoveries Suspense			00	10	
Revenue and Expenditure Account—					
		Rs.	P.		
Surplus as on 31-3-66		15,74,507	52		
Deficit during the year		3,57,291	00		
				12,17,216	52
					77,12,743
Dr. Wali Mohd. Waqf Alal Aulad					
Capital		1,00,000	00		
Miscellaneous Receipts		3,141	43		
					1,03,141
Overdrafts with Bank—					
General Fund		23,98,372	98		
Development Grant Account		4,99,893	79		
Medical College Fund		3,59,215	32		
				32,57,482	09
TOTAL				6,70,32,050	75

J. P. GOEL,

Assistant Accounts Officer.

The corresponding figure appearing under "Inter-Fund Advances" at page 17 is Rs. 2,67,063,52. The discrepancy of Rs. 25,000 has been set right in 1967-68 Accounts.

AUDIT CERTIFICATE

I have generally examined the Balance Sheets of the Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh as they stood on 31st March, 1966 and on the basis of general scrutiny of the records and information and explanations given to me and as shown in the book of University, I certify that in my opinion Balance Sheets have been properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the University.

Allahabad :

The 2nd December, 1968.

B. N. SRIVASTAVA,

Senior Deputy Accountant General (O.A.D.)]

BANK RECONCILIATION STATEMENT AS ON 31st MARCH, 1966

	General Fund	Development Grant Account	Deposit Account	Medical College Fund	Provident Fund
	Rs. P.	Rs. P.	Rs. P.	Rs. P.	Rs. P.
Balance as per Accounts	— 23,98,372·98	— 4,99,893·79	+ 99,500·82	— 3,59,215·32	+ 5,21,777·85
<i>Deduct—</i>					
Remittances in transit	— 2,79,250·57	— 24,394·18	— 1,43,336·30	— 1,68,290·57	— 4,55,913·15
Erroneous/Unclassified de- bits by the Bank	— 62,952·52	— 1,808·99	— 1,162·11
	— 27,40,576·07	— 5,26,096·96	— 43,835·38	— 5,27,505·89	+ 64,702·59
<i>Add—</i>					
Uncashed Cheques	+ 9,58,640·80	+ 12,45,784·80	+ 82,615·91	+ 4,860·78	4,426·41
Erroneous / Unclassified credits by the Bank	+ 32,896·98	+ 22,045·00
Balance as per Bank State- ment.	— 17,49,038·29	+ 7,41,732·84	+ 38,780·53	— 5,22,645·10	— 69,129·00

ANNEXURE TO THE
STATEMENT SHOWING THE DETAILS

Sl. No.	Name of Fund	Investments including Fixed Deposits	Lands and Buildings	Books	Equipment
		Rs. P.	Rs. P.	Rs. P.	Rs. P.
1	Permanent Endowment .	30,00,000·00
2	Permanent Reserve Fund	18,86,122·13	1,11,937·06
3	Special Floating Reserve Fund	4,21,498·21	4,71,536·99
4	Floating Reserve Fund .	..	2,13,480·28
5	Trust Fund .	4,01,496·67	76,945·52
6	Depreciation Fund .	10,99,146·08
7	Building Fund .	..	2,22,01,139·10
8	College of Engineering and Technology Fund.	2,49,375·00	9,42,587·50
9	Current Expenses Fund.	95,849·02	20,871·67
	Total—General Fund .	71,53,487·11	1,40,38,498·32
10	Development Fund .	..	1,52,28,694·63	17,01,634·73	[66,80,179·83]
11	Deposit Account .	76,13,956·26	17,72,027·57
12	Provident Fund .	41,61,293·50
13	Medical College Fund .	17,63,741·31	72,88,207·69
14	Dr. Wali Mohd. Waqf, Alal Aulad	1,00,000·00
	Grand Total .	1,27,92,488·18	3,83,27,428·21	17,01,634·73	66,80,179·83

BALANCE SHEET

OF VARIOUS FUNDS AS AT 31st MARCH, 1966.

Furniture		Loans and Advances		Inter-Fund Advances		Miscellaneous Debit Balances		Cash Balance		Total	
Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
..			30,00,000.00	
..			1,940.81		20,00,000.00	
..		8,000.00			37,322.78		9,38,357.98	
..			1,47,649.51		3,61,129.79	
..			68,691.47		5,47,133.66	
..			2,04,431.41		13,03,577.49	
..			5,469.56		1,22,06,608.66	
..		497.45			—21,212.91		11,71,247.04	
..		149.09		4,52,040.59		35,49,906.82		—28,41,934.58		12,76,882.81	
(a)											
..		8,646.54		4,52,040.59		35,49,906.82		—23,97,641.95		2,28,04,937.43	
10,00,918.79		8,000.00		50,000.00		1,92,867.66		—4,99,893.79		2,43,62,401.85	
..		8,032.84		8,25,862.14		67,418.74		99,500.92		33,86,798.47	
..		2,83,474.45		4,38,000.00		..		5,21,777.85		54,04,545.80	
..		..		20,000.00		..		—3,59,215.32		77,12,743.68	
..			3,141.43		1,03,141.43	
10,00,918.79		3,08,153.83		17,85,902.73		38,10,193.22		—26,32,330.86		6,37,74,568.66	

(a) Includes Rs. 28,211.06 on account of Permanent Advances.

(b) Includes Rs. 731.03 lying with the State Bank of India, Karachi.

Audit Report on the accounts of the Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, for the year 1966-67

1. Losses due to thefts/shortages—

(a) Articles worth Rs. 5,343 lying in various Departments were stolen during the year. Reports were made to the Police and the results of their investigations are awaited. No departmental investigations have been conducted so far.

(b) Physical verification of various stores in all the Departments of the University for the year 1966-67 completed in March, 1968, disclosed shortages worth Rs. 18,005. Action for fixing the responsibility, it is stated, is being taken.

(c) Cash amounting to Rs. 6,554 and articles worth Rs. 16,752 were reported in the last Audit Report as stolen or found short. Final action to fix the responsibility and to write-off the amount is yet (February, 1968) to be completed.

2. Shortage of Library Books—

Physical verification of books in the Central and various departmental Libraries completed for the first time in August, 1967, disclosed shortages of 12,400 books costing Rs. 1.24 lakhs. A sum of Rs. 14,980 has been realised upto February, 1968 and further investigations are stated to be in progress.

3. Temporary Advances—

Though the temporary advances paid to various departmental officers are required to be cleared within the financial year of payment, a total amount of Rs. 90,363 in 136 cases remained unadjusted by the end of February, 1968, for want of detailed bills from the respective departmental officers. Year-wise details are given below:—

Year	Amount Rs.
1952-53	4,965
1953-54	6,394
1954-55	22,579
1961-62	559
1962-63	8,401
1963-64	2,523
1964-65	222
1965-66	248
1966-67	4,472
TOTAL	90,363

It was stated that the University authorities are aware of the problem and that the outstandings have been reduced from Rs. 1,42,425 to Rs. 90,363 since the date of the last audit.

4. Interest on overdrafts—

The University had to pay Rs. 3,15,199 as interest on overdrafts from the bank during 1964-65 to 1966-67 as follows:—

Year	Amount Rs.
1964-65	63,365
1965-66	1,31,817
1966-67	1,20,017
TOTAL	3,15,199

The overdrafts from the bank are due to old deficits of Rs. 13.76 lakhs for the years 1947-48 to 1950-51. The question of payment of special grants so that these deficits can be wiped off is under correspondence with the University Grants Commission.

5. Outstanding dues—

Rs. 4,935 were recoverable on 31st March, 1967 from private parties on account of services rendered by the University Press.

6. *Sale of University Publications—*

In paragraph 148(e) of the Central Audit Report (Civil) 1966, it was pointed out that on 31st December, 1964, 39,623 copies of various books (published by the University) worth Rs. 2.44 lakhs were in stock in the University. On 30th November, 1967, there were 33,151 copies of 86 books worth about Rs. 2.50 lakhs in stock. It was stated that these books are mainly required for research by various University libraries and research institutions and, therefore, the sales are not large.

7. *Bank reconciliation—*

Bank reconciliation is to be done monthly. However, the reconciliation of cash book balances of the General Fund Account, Development Grant Account and Provident Fund Account with the bank balances has (at the end of May, 1968) been completed upto August, 1967, August, 1967 and October, 1967 respectively. There were heavy differences between the cash book and bank balances. The differences pertain to 1963 onwards. The debits and credits given by the bank but not appearing in the University cash book as also remittances to the bank but not appearing in the bank's accounts are yet (May, 1968) to be linked and adjusted.

8. *Misappropriation in the Building Department—*

During November, 1965, to January, 1967, a total amount of Rs. 3.449 was misappropriated by the cashier. The cashier has been suspended and further departmental action against him is in progress. The case has not yet (February, 1968) been made over to the police. The misappropriation was facilitated because the cash book of the Building department was neither checked by the University Engineer nor by the Divisional Accountant in the department.

9. *Miscellaneous*

(i) The Tibbiya College Dewakhara purchased different types of containers and packing materials worth Rs. 0.79 lakhs and Rs. 1.03 lakhs during the year 1964-65 and 1965-66 respectively. No stock account showing the receipts, issues and the balances in stock of these containers, etc. was, however, maintained by the University.

(ii) *Proforma* accounts of the Electricity Department have never been prepared. This is attributed to inadequacy of staff.

(iii) Procedural irregularities have been incorporated in a "Memorandum of Points" and made over (in March, 1968) to the Office of the Treasurer, Aligarh Muslim University, for necessary action and reporting compliance direct to the undersigned with in a month of its receipt.

Allahabad :
The 19th June, 1968.

H. B. BHAR,
Accountant General, Uttar Pradesh.

Countersigned

New Delhi :
The 26th June, 1968.

S. RANGANATHAN,
Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

GENERAL REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

1965-66	Expenditure	1966-67
Rs. P		Rs. P. Rs. P.
GENERAL FUND		
I. General Administration—		
10,41,343·29	Salaries	9,88,715·02
5,69,891·00	Allowances	5,10,378·62
36,038·62	Provident Fund Contribution	40,545·18
16,44,325·01	Other Charges	17,58,831·38
32,91,597·92		32,98,470·20
2. Faculties—		
Salaries—		
17,71,578·82	Teaching Staff	18,71,845·75
4,09,451·83	Non-Teaching Staff	4,16,386·39
Allowances—		
2,47,954·20	Teaching Staff	3,03,637·68
1,88,290·03	Non-Teaching Staff	2,43,565·83
Provident Fund Contribution—		
1,23,081·84	Teaching Staff	1,32,165·84
20,202·17	Non-Teaching Staff	21,211·37
2,93,097·21	Other Charges	4,42,078·78
30,53,656·10		34,30,891·64
3. University Colleges—		
Salaries—		
6,76,902·12	Teaching Staff	7,77,706·82
3,52,792·15	Non-Teaching Staff	3,70,737·09
Allowances—		
1,14,867·74	Teaching Staff	1,19,774·38
1,52,748·68	Non-Teaching Staff	1,96,617·51
Provident Fund Contribution—		
47,983·44	Teaching Staff	55,187·81
18,656·80	Non-Teaching Staff	21,658·77
2,81,749·54	Other Charges	3,11,260·23
16,45,700·47		18,52,942·72
4. University Schools—		
Salaries—		
3,02,067·01	Teaching Staff	3,04,387·73
72,281·88	Non-Teaching Staff	77,240·39
Allowances—		
82,183·60	Teaching Staff	1,19,662·55
48,125·09	Non-Teaching Staff	62,359·99
Provident Fund Contribution—		
19,222·13	Teaching Staff	18,915·94
2,189·21	Non-Teaching Staff	3,846·16
48,871·49	Other Charges	54,703·75
5,74,940·41		6,41,116·51

ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR 1966-67

Income	1966-67]		1965-66	
	Rs.	P	Rs.	P
(CURRENT EXPENSES)				
Grants-in-aid—				
Central Government Grants	94,90,000	00		86,95,680
U. P. Government Grants	2,18,731	85		12,17,856
Former Ruling States Grants	6,000	00		6,856
	<hr/>		97,14,731	85
				<hr/>
				89,20,392
2. Fees from, Students—				
Tution Fee	7,19,524	46		6,63,007
Admission Fee	29,454	49		26,716
Hostel Fee	2,05,410	43		1,73,817
Examination and Admission Test fee	2,99,003	34		2,71,010
Registration and Enrolment Fee	31,895	00		28,954
Medical Fee	48,486	50		42,177
Other Fees	48,556	80		53,972
	<hr/>		13,82,331	02
				<hr/>
				12,59,655
3. Other Income—				
Interest on Investment	1,84,450	12		1,57,783
Rents	1,20,501	58		1,31,777
Agriculture Income	79,932	64		1,32,162
Transfer from Depreciation Fund				1,10,796
Other Miscellaneous Income	95,214	20		1,70,686
	<hr/>		4,80,098	54
				<hr/>
				7,03,206

1965-66		Expenditure		1966-67	
Rs.	P.			Rs.	P.
5. University Institutions—					
Salaries—					
29,332.33		Teaching Staff	. . .	30,956.67	
44,212.54		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	49,384.78	
Allowances—					
3,240.00		Teaching Staff	. . .	4,230.00	
16,305.97		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	18,385.58	
Provident Fund Contribution—					
2,302.13		Teaching Staff	. . .	2,577.17	
1,650.44		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	2,460.17	
4,018.25		Other Charges	. . .	23,142.53	
1,21,061.66					1,31,136.90
6. Other Departments—					
Salaries—					
88,840.31		Teaching Staff	. . .	1,00,321.47	
68,589.81		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	5,89,660.21	
Allowances—					
21,638.17		Teaching Staff	. . .	91,849.03	
4,50,548.95		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	3,69,383.93	
Provident Fund Contribution—					
4,852.84		Teaching Staff	. . .	6,759.68	
27,120.68		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	32,452.22	
8,33,563.89		Other Charges	. . .	9,08,262.62	
17,95,154.65					20,98,689.16
1,04,82,111.21		Total—Expenditure	. . .		1,14,53,247.13
4,01,142.35		Revenue Surplus	. . .		1,23,914.28
1,08,83,253.56		Total	. . .		1,15,77,161.41

DEVELOPMENT GRANT ACCOUNT

7. Faculty of Arts—

Salaries—					
1,49,890.65		Teaching Staff	. . .	1,27,138.94	
6,095.72		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	9,266.12	
Allowances—					
24,804.46		Teaching Staff	. . .	30,686.67	
2,825.86		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	4,328.73	
Provident Fund Contribution—					
4,710.85		Teaching Staff	. . .	5,602.02	
259.20		Non teaching	. . .	1,22.60	
27,302.87		Other Charges	. . .	1,000.00	
2,15,889.61					1,78,14,500

Income	1966-67		1965-66	
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
(CURRENT EXPENSES)—<i>contd.</i>				

21

.. .. .

Total—Income	.	.	.	<u>1,15,77,161·41</u>	<u>1,08,83,253·56</u>
--------------	---	---	---	-----------------------	-----------------------

PLAN EXPENDITURE

1. Grants-in-aid from U.G.C.—

Faculty of Arts . . .	1,83,400·00	1,77,637·15
Faculty of Science . . .	3,30,360·08	2,01,016·39
Faculty of Commerce . . .	36,600·00	15,000·00
Faculty of Law . . .		15,000·00
Faculty of Theology . . .		8,000·00
Faculty of Engineering and Technology . . .	7,68,000·00	22,73,946·00
Faculty of Medicine . . .	15,17,680·63	10,00,000·00
Other Departments and Institutions	4,59,019·14	5,29,454·56
	<u>32,95,059·85</u>	<u>42,20,054·10</u>

1965-66		Expenditure		1966-67	
Rs.	P.			Rs.	P.
2. Faculty of Science—					
Salaries—					
1,10,787	18	Teaching Staff	. . .	1,17,498	83
6,836	84	Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	13,151	86
Allowances—					
26,289	09	Teaching Staff	. . .	27,566	60
3,022	91	Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	6,204	26
Provident Fund Contribution—					
3,677	83	Teaching Staff	. . .	5,128	82
266	25	Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	360	12
1,13,068	59	Other Charges	. . .	95,785	46
2,63,948	59				2,65,695
3. Faculty of Commerce—					
Salaries—					
29,446	84	Teaching Staff	. . .	29,892	33
..		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	680	33
Allowances—					
3,070	90	Teaching Staff	. . .	6,563	50
—		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	458	94
Provident Fund Contribution—					
1,044	43	Teaching Staff	. . .	1,473	42
—		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	19	56
—		Other Charges	. . .	906	35
33,562	17				39,994
4. Faculty of Law—					
Salaries—					
24,925	94	Teaching Staff	. . .	16,769	03
Allowances—					
4,115	88	Teaching Staff	. . .	3,179	15
Provident Fund Contribution—					
1,594	00	Teaching Staff	. . .	1,047	34
499	80	Other Charges	
31,135	62				20,995
5. Faculty of Theology—					
Salaries—					
5,329	00	Teaching Staff	. . .	5,710	65
Allowances—					
1,700	33	Teaching Staff	. . .	1,838	25
Provident Fund Contribution—					
214	92	Teaching Staff	. . .	408	29
7,244	25				7,957

Income	1966-67		1965-66	
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
2. Fees from Students—				
Faculty of Engineering and Technology	73,383	95		96,479.61
Faculty of Medicine	55,821	95		62,234.84
			1,29,205.90	
				1,58,714.45

1965-66		Expenditure		1966-67	
Rs.	nP.			Rs.	P.
6. Faculty of Engineering and Technology—					
		Salaries—			
7,37,455·47		Teaching Staff	. . .	7,44,502·70	
1,87,352·41		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	2,40,986·32	
		Allowances—			
1,25,684·94		Teaching Staff	. . .	1,30,897·89	
85,677·47		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	1,16,537·55	
		Provident Fund Contribution—			
24,000·19		Teaching Staff	. . .	38,542·65	
11,240·86		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	12,759·41	
2,16,617·07		Other Charges	. . .	2,61,695·28	
					15,45,921·80
13,89,028·41					
7. Faculty of Medicine—					
		Salaries—			
3,57,628·01		Teaching Staff	. . .	4,62,603·57	
2,34,530·41		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	2,78,765·40	
		Allowances—			
5,77,316·71		Teaching Staff	. . .	3,22,087·06	
1,00,363·93		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	1,56,552·54	
		Provident Fund Contribution—			
11,432·52		Teaching Staff	. . .	18,196·01	
9,390·16		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	12,366·87	
2,50,655·82		Other Charges	. . .	3,49,318·97	
					16,00,090·42
11,41,317·56					
8. Other Departments—					
		Salaries—			
89,938·68		Teaching Staff	. . .	20,942·77	
19,849·96		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	122,406·42	
		Allowances—			
34,713·58		Teaching Staff	. . .	2,920·75	
8,045·64		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	48,778·54	
		Provident Fund Contribution—			
4,680·13		Teaching Staff	. . .	1,117·47	
426·73		Non-Teaching Staff	. . .	6,243·86	
4,16,946·04		Other Charges	. . .	1,86,792·98	
					3,89,202·69
5,74,600·76					
36,56,726·97		Total—Expenditure			40,48,003·18
7,22,041·58		Transferred to unexpended Balances			..
43,78,768·55		TOTAL			40,48,003·18

Income	1966-67		1965-66	
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Total—Income			₹ 34,24,265·75	43,78,768·55
Transferred to unexpended Balances			6,23,737·43	..
Total			40,48,003·18	43,78,768·55

1965-66		Expenditure		1966-67	
Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT					
I. Electricity Department—					
93,917·39		Salaries		76,695·06	
22,043·74		Allowances		42,942·61	
3,894·06		Provident Fund Contribution		3,046·66	
3,22,25·92		Other Charges		4,63,845·99	
					5,86,530·32
<u>4,42,681·11</u>					
2. M. U Hospital Drug Store—					
5,678·73		Salaries		5,573·20	
1,287·50		Allowances		1,170·00	
133·38		Provident Fund Contribution		124·35	
24,990·57		Other Charges		21,943·83	
					28,811·38
<u>32,090·18</u>					
4,74,771·29		Total—Expenditure			6,15,341·70
784·59		Surplus M. U. Drug Store			..
<u>4,75,555·88</u>		TOTAL			6,15,341·70

Income	1966-67		1965-66	
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
(COMMERCIAL DEPARTMENTS).				
1. Electricity Department—				
Sale of Electricity	4,53,656	81		3,10,695
Miscellaneous		577		65,075
	<u>4,54,234</u>		28	<u>3,75,770</u>
				29
2. M. U. Hospital Drug Store—				
Sale of Medicines			15,563	32,874
				<u>77</u>
Total—Income			4,69,797	4,08,645
Deficit—Electricity Deptt.			1,32,296	66,910
Deficit—M. U. Hospital Drug Store			13,248	
	<u>13,248</u>		36	<u>..</u>
Total			6,15,341	4,75,555
			70	88

As on 31-3-66		Liabilities	As on 31-3-67			
			Amount		Amount	
Rs.	P.		Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Permanant Endowment—						
		Capitalised Value of Investment made by the Umiversity under Section 7 of the Aligarh Muslim University Act, XL of 1920 . . .			30,00,000·00	
30,00,000·00						
Permanent Reserve Fund—						
10,05,831·25		H. E. Nizam's Donation . . .	10,05,831·25			
		Prince of Wales Science School Account . . .	2,78,578·34			
2,78,578·34		Sri Syed Ahmad Memorial Fund . . .	1,39,026·54			
1,39,026·54		Capital of M.A.O. College . . .	55,332·55			
55,332·55		Transfers from— . . .				
		Floating Reserve Fund . . .	4,51,147·08			
4,51,147·08		Current Expenses Fund . . .	70,084·24			
70,084·24						
20,00,000·00					20,00,000·00	
Special Floating Reserve Fund—						
<i>Grants from former Ruling States—</i>						
2,48,479·44		(1) Bhopal Grant for Science College . . .	2,48,479·44			
		(2) H. H. the Ruler of Bhopal Grant for Flying Club . . .	50,000·00			
50,000·00		(2) Bahawalpur State Grant for General Buildings . . .	65,000·00			
65,000·00		(4) Mahmudabad Grant for Grneral Buildings . . .	38,000·00			
38,000·00						
<i>U. G. C. Grants—</i>						
1,54,000·00		For purchase of Evacuce Property . . .	1,54,000·00			
35,000·00		For purchase of "Kashana" . . .	35,000·00			
<i>Donations—</i>						
21,375·82		Donation for Art Gallery by late Prof. Moinuddin . . .	21,375·82			
		Interest on Moinuddin's Art Gallery . . .	2,400·00			
2,400·00		Cost of Waqf House of Mr. Naziruddin Khan of Shahjahanpur . . .	1,600·00			
1,600·00		General Buildings by Hajee Mohd. Zahoor Mohd. Saced . . .	500·00			
500·00		Auchinleck Memorial Fund . . .	99,753·37			
99,753·37		Polytechnic Account . . .	1,50,415·28			
1,50,415·28		Sunni Theology . . .	38·00			
38·00		Sunni Theology Books . . .	2,634·24			
2,634·24		Islamic Studies . . .	1,500·00			
1,500·00		Islamic Studies Books . . .	8,702·00			
8,702·00		H ndi and Sanskrit Books . . .	100·00			
100·00		Blind School . . .	693·46			
693·46		Political Science Books . . .	2,209·12			
2,209·12						
Employees' Deposits for Purchase of Land—						
674·00		Mr. Jan Mohd. Khan . . .	674·00			
2,234·00		Mr. Inayatullah Kureshy . . .	2,234·00			
678·00		Me. Niaz Ahmad Siddiqi . . .	678·00			
52,371·25		Miscellaneous receipts . . .	52,371·25			
9,38,357·98					9,38,357·98	

Assets	As on 31-3-67				As on 31-3-66	
	Amount		Amount			
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Investments—						
Permanent Endowment	30,00,000	00			30,00,000	00
Permanent Reserve Fund	18,86,122	13			18,86,122	13
Special Floating Reserve Fund	4,21,498	21			4,21,498	21
Trust Fund	2,07,131	77			2,05,981	77
Depreciation Fund	10,67,952	33			10,99,146	08
College of Engineering and Tech- nology Fund	2,49,375	00			2,49,375	00
Current Expenses Fund	95,849	02			95,849	02
Deposit Account	4,24,991	14			4,53,956	26
Provident Fund Account	30,28,561	63			30,61,293	50
Medical College Fund	7,63,751	31			7,63,74	31
Wali Mohd. Waqf Alal Aulad	1,00,000	00			1,00,000	00
			1,12,45,232	54		
					1,13,36,973	28
Fixed Deposits—						
Saifi Trust Account	27,094	90			27,094	90
Sirohi Waqf Account	1,68,420	00			1,68,420	00
Trust Fund	3,000	00				
Deposit Account	1,60,000	00			1,60,000	00
Provident Fund Account	21,05,500	00			11,00,000	00
			24,64,014	90		
					14,55,514	90
Lands and Buildings—						
Permanent Reserve Fund	1,11,937	06			1,11,937	06
Special Floating Reserve Fund	4,71,536	99			4,71,536	99
Floating Reserve Fund	2,13,480	28			2,13,480	28
Trust Fund	76,945	52			76,945	52
Building Fund	1,22,01,139	10			1,22,01,139	10
Engineering College Fund	9,42,587	50			9,42,587	50
Current Expenses Fund	20,871	87			20,871	87
Development Grant Account	1,88,82,376	11			1,52,28,694	63
Deposit Account (Ford Foundation Fund)	17,79,152	57			17,72,027	57
Medical College Fund	73,78,676	59			72,88,207	69
			4,20,78,703	59		
					3,83,27,428	21
Books—Development	Grant					
Account			20,38,714	88	17,01,634	73
Equipment—Development	Grant					
Account			88,02,010	75	66,80,179	83
Furniture—Development	Grant					
Account			13,82,604	36	10,00,918	79
Loans and Advances—						
Special Floating Reserve Fund	8,000	00			8,000	00
College of Engineering and Technology Fund	497	45			497	45
Current Expenses Fund	79	09			149	09
Development Grant Account					8,000	00
Deposit Account	6,699	40			8,032	84
Provident Fund Account	2,85,974	45			2,83,474	45
			3,01,250	39		
					3,08,153	83

As on 31-3-66		Liabilities	As on 31-3-67			
Rs.	P.		Amount		Amount	
Rs.	P.		Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Floating Reserve Fund						
3,49,959.50		Capitalised Funds	3,49,959.50			
		<i>Donations—</i>				
5,000.00		Mr. Syed Jawad Ali	5,000.00			
1,000.00		Mr. Syed Nawab Ali	1,000.00			
1,000.00		Mr. Wali Mohd. Swaleh Bhai	1,000.00			
434.11		Amir Khusio Fund	434.11			
3,436.18		Qunoon Masoodi Fund	3,436.18			
300.00		For Compilation of Muslim University History	300.00			
3,61,129.79					3,61,129.79	
Trust Fund—						
1,07,773.36		General Scholarship Fund	1,07,773.36			
64,899.77		Arabic Scholarship Fund	64,899.77			
2,000.00		Poor Students' Fund	2,000.00			
		<i>Miscellaneous Endowments—</i>				
48,947.99		Prizes and Medals	48,947.99			
1,000.00		Sir Shah Mohd. Sulaiman Gold Medal	1,000.00			
1,000.00		Lady Ali Shah Gold Medal	1,000.00			
1,005.50		Col. Haider Khan Gold Medal	1,005.50			
11,000.00		Saifi Gold Medal	11,000.00			
50,000.00		Sir Abdur Rauf Scholarship for Engineering Students	50,000.00			
3,338.75		Sheikh Azizullah Scholarship Z.A.C. Bonds donated by Nawab Sahib of Chattari for Tamga Saudi	3,338.75			
2,000.00		Sir Willam Marris Scholarship	2,000.00			
2,055.37		Safi Trust Fund	2,055.37			
24,700.00		Sirohi Waqf Fund	24,700.00			
1,75,000.00		Sirohi Waqf Interest Account	1,75,000.00			
5,379.94		Dr. Radha Krishnan Scholarship	5,379.94			
43,538.48		Interest and Rent Account	43,538.48			
3,494.50		Prof. Hameeduddin Khan's Waqf	3,494.50			
5,47,133.66					5,62,245.84	
13,03,577.49		Depreciation Fund			13,36,184.77	
1,22,06,608.66		Building Fund			1,22,06,608.66	
11,71,247.04		College of Engineering & Technology Fund			11,71,247.04	
Miscellaneous Credit Balances—						
<i>Current Expenses Fund—</i>						
19,000.00		Reserve Fund—Girls High School	19,000.00			
65,098.72		Women's College Fund	65,098.72			
9,404.19		Women's College Security Deposit Account	9,404.19			
22,285.09		Provident Fund Recoveries Suspense	22,285.09			

Assets	As on 31-3-67		As on 31-3-66	
	Amount		Amount	
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Inter-Fund Advances				
From General Fund to—				
Development Grant Account	1,51,927	07	1,84,927	07
Medical College Fund	2,67,063	52	2,67,063	52
Provident Fund Account	1,75,050	00	50	00
From Deposit Account to—				
General Fund	4,46,004	39	6,08,362	14
Development Grant Account	2,30,000	00	2,17,500	00
From Medical College Fund to				
Deposit Account	20,000	00	20,000	00
From Provident Fund Account to—				
Development Grant Account	2,08,000	00	2,08,000	00
Medical College Fund	2,30,000	00	2,30,000	00
From Development Grant Account				
to Medical College		50,000	00
			17,28,044	98
			17,85	902 73
Permanent Advances		28,942	12
			28,211	06
Miscellaneous Debt Balances—				
Current Expenses Fund :—				
Advances on Account	1,93,968	58	1,93,968	58
Advances to Tibbiya College Dawakhavn	8,713	70	8,713	70
Outstanding dues from Students	1,82,447	13	1,89,026	25
Stock Suspense Account	3,49,571	94	4,22,459	84
Coal Suspense Account	70,979	05	75,772	47
Accumulated deficit of the University to				
the end of 1955-56	13,76,540	60	13,76,640	60
Accumulated deficit of Tibbiya College				
to the end of 1952-53	1,91,951	31	1,91,951	31
Accumulated deficit of Engineering				
College to the end of 1952-53	2,02,401	89	2,02,401	89
Loan to M. U. Girls High School	4,000	00	4,000	00
Loan to General Education for				
publication	7,660	71	7,660	71
Security Deposit of Agriculture with				
Hydle Division, Roorkee	2,500	00	2,500	00
Suspense Accounts	86,320	62	1,70,495	38
Salaries Cheques	25,528	92	26,805	49
Salary Advance Suspense	5,531	00	..	
Unclassified payments made by the				
Bank	1,32,287	72	1,32,287	72
Amount of theft in Building Deptt	5,637	00		
Revenue and Expenditure Account :				
	Rs.	P.		
Deficit as on 31-3-66	5,17,011	82	5,17,011	82
Less Surplus during				
year	1,23,914	28		
	3,93,097	54	32,39,237	71
			35,21,695	76

As on 31-3-66		Liabilities	As on 31-3-67			
Rs.	P		Amount		Amount	
			Rs.	P	Rs.	P
8,194.09		Agriculture College Fund	8,194.09			
59,592.80		Students Aid Fund	61,903.14			
2,418.14		Library Deposit Account	2,418.14			
Boys/Girls Fund :						
18,271.71		City High School	23,479.05			
748.33		City Branch School	583.08			
20,301.89		Girls High School	26,410.27			
279.00		Foreign Students, Welfare Fund . .	279.00			
7,518.54		Income Tax Account	5,773.54			
		Unclassified credits afforded by the				
		Bank	45,729.80			
45,729.80		Recoveries Suspense	84,224.83			
55,723.58						
Advances from—						
83,000.00		Various Halls	75,000.00			
85,000.00		Scholarship Account	85,000.00			
1,14,864.22		Boarding House	1,64,864.22			
6,08,362.14		Deposit Account	4,46,004.39			
51,090.57		Other Miscellaneous Accounts . .	1,14,049.90			
		Royalty—History Department . .	6,784.96			
12,76,882.81					13,17,905.59	
2,28,04,937.43		TOTAL—General Fund			2,28,93,679.67	
Development Grant Account—]						
2,34,39,085.95		Capital Grants from the University				
		Grants Commission	3,08,57,324.88			
		Deposit account of the grant for Health				
		Services—Ophthalmology	2,600.00			
		Deposit account of the grant from				
		Council of Scientific and Industrial				
53,493.36		Research	74,919.71			
		Deposit account of the grant received				
		from the Council of Agriculture				
2,712.38		Research	3,407.54			
		Deposit account of the grant received				
		for Scholarships and Fellowships—				
University Grants Commission—						
30,428.32		Senior/Junior Research Fellowship .	30,500.81			
6,304.50		Post-Graduate Research in Science]				
		and Humanities	12,087.01			
Government of India Grant—						
7,872.93		Research Training Scholarship . .	13,508.18			
30,441.55		U. P. Government Grant	4,467.10			
		Recoveries Suspense	46,794.75			
24,981.72		Suspense Account	1,647.39			
		Liabilities to General Fund on account				
1,53,654.07		of Agriculture Farm	1,53,654.07			
3,000.00		Loan to General Education Centere .	3,000.00			
Advances from—						
1,84,927.07		General Fund	1,51,927.07			
2,08,000.00		Provident Fund	2,08,000.00			
2,17,500.00		Deposit Account	2,30,000.00			
2,43,62,401.85					3,17,93,838.58	

Assets	As on 31-3-67				As on 31-3-66	
	Amount		Amount			
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Development Grant Account—						
Payment made on Hospital Account .			5,723·12		5,723·12	
Recoveries Suspense Account	19,306·02	
Revenue and Expenditure Account :						
	Rs.	P.				
Account overspent as on 31-3-66	[1,67,838·52				1,67,838·52	
Amount overspent during the year ;	6,23,737·43					
			17,91,575·95			
				7,97,299·07		
					1,92,867·66	
Deposit Account—						
Blind School Revenue Account .			996·22		996·22	
Old Outstanding Account .			15,912·54		15,912·54	
Deposit account of the grant received from P. L. 480 for Plantation in U. P.			6,161·66	
Electricity Department Income and Expenditure Account :						
	Rs.	P.				
Deficit as on 31-3-66	44,348·32				[44,348·32	
Deficit during the year	1,32,296·04		1,76,644·36			
Drug Store Income and Expenditure Account :						
	Rs.	P.				
Surplus as on 31-3-66	3,950·37					
Deficit during the year .	13,248·36		9,297·99			
				2,02,851·11		
					67,418·74	
Cash Balances—						
General Fund (with State Bank of India Karachi)			731·03		731·03	
Deposit Account			4,25,378·24		99,500·92	
Provident Fund			7,48,601·79		[5,21,777·85	
Dr. Wali Mohd. Waqf Alai Aulad			10,470·60		3,141·43	
				11,85,181·66		
					6,25,151·23	

As on 31-3-66	Liabilities	As on 31-3-67	
		Amount	Amount
	Rs. P.	Rs. P.	
Deposit Account—			
17,72,027.57	Ford Foundation Grant	17,79,152.57	
48,650.96	Duty Society and R.D.H. Account	25,351.16	
8,600.00	Duty Society Building Account	8,600.00	
55,000.00	M. U. Student's Union Account	55,000.00	
27,408.99	Vice-Chancellor's Fund	22,375.86	
69.00	Vice-Chancellor's Relief Fund	69.00	
4,144.13	Cycle Registration Account	2,707.87	
388.71	Film Club Account	170.04	
130.79	N. C. C. Account	23.43	
221.36	Poor Student's Fund	296.36	
6,925.84	Personal Deposits	6,925.84	
2.00	Old Boy's Association Account	4.00	
2,599.83	Mosque Fund	2,599.83	
8,116.78	Brick Kiln Suspense Account	19,988.53	
Security Deposits—			
7,38,977.58	Building Contractors	7,63,680.04	
6,648.53	Cashiers	6,094.88	
1,637.35	Vendors	1,668.85	
150.00	Compounders	150.00	
4,600.34	Electricity Consumers	4,930.34	
3,683.99	Hobbies Workshop Amenities Fund	4,200.75	
	Deposit account of the grant from the International Council for the study of Afro Asian Geography		
27,014.91	Administrative and Ministerial Staff Association Account	27,014.91	
1,884.45	Interest on Investments Account	5,230.20	
2,14,982.09	Interest on Depreciation Fund Investments	2,21,521.14	
..	Fikro Nazar Magazine Account	567.87	
2,177.43	Tibbiya College Scholarship Fund	2,177.43	
19,479.58	World University Service	19,479.58	
2,788.04	Tennis Club Account	3,037.04	
120.00	Union Magazine Fee Account	120.00	
446.15	Vice-Chancellor's Flood Relief Fund	446.15	
672.50	Deposit account of the grant received from J. and K. Government for creation of Fellowship in Hindi and Urdu	672.50	
17,380.82		41,518.32	
Unexpended Balances Account—			
	J. K. Govt. grant for renovation of Sir Syed House		
40,429.04	J.K. Govt. grant for purchase of equipment for N.R.S.C.	40,429.04	
50.61	J. & K. Govt. grant for construction of an overhead water tank and purchase of furniture	50.61	
3038.31	Tarwala, Bungalow Mosque Account	32,320.00	
99,940.00	Donation from Prime Minister of Kuwait House Building Loans from Provident Fund Account	912.87	
11,820.73	Agriculture Form Revenue and Expenditure Account	99,940.00	
138.51	Interest on Ford Foundation Investments	54,268.95	
5,171.36	Deposit account of the grant from J and K for construction of Kashmir House Khalida Umaruddin Scholarship Account	138.51	
37,881.74		2,119.34	
10,000.00		699.38	
		10,000.00	

Assets	As on 31-3-67		As on 31-3-66
	Amount	Amount	
Rs. P.	Rs. P.	Rs. P.	Rs. P.

As on 31-3-66		Liabilities		As on 31-3-67	
				Amount	Amount
				Rs. P.	Rs. P.
277.10	Khalid Rashid Scholarship Account .			..	
..	Deposit account of the grant from P.L.				
..	480 for studies in Plantation .			14,103.86	
..	Deposit account of the grant from P.L.				
..	480 for Zoology Department .			35,274.37	
1,696.96	Salaries' cheques .			1,696.96	
20,000.00	Advances from Medical College Fund.			20,000.00	
1,59,074.74	Ford Foundation Income and Expendi- ture Account.			1,23,316.01	
16,399.28	Other Miscellaneous Accounts .			27,333.46	
..	Advance from Scholarship Account .			1,86,699.00	
3,950.37	Surplus M.U. Drug Store .			..	36,75,076.85
33,86,798.47					
54,04,545.80	Provident Fund Account .				66,06,637.87
Medical College Fund—					
Donations from—					
16,05,000.00	Stakes .			16,05,000.00	
22,99,649.16	Individuals .			22,99,649.16	
10,00,000.00	His Majesty the King of Saud .			10,00,000.00	
39,680.13	Rusi Mistry of Bombay .			39,680.13	
13,722.90	Miss E.G. Everest, England .			13,722.90	
Advances from—					
2,42,063.52	General Fund .			*2,42,063.52	
2,30,000.00	Provident Fund .			2,30,000.00	
50,000.00	Development Grant Account .			..	
30,127.08	Medical Study Loans .			31,912.08	
1,66,779.20	Contractors outstanding dues .			2,20,208.74	
Liabilities paid from—					
17,574.84	General Fund .			18,574.84	
1,96,594.44	Development Grant Account .			1,96,594.44	
2,17,030.70	Material at site Account .			2,17,616.54	
3,87,305.09	Contractors' Security Deposits .			4,23,053.45	
00.10	Recoveries Suspense .			2,171.56	
Revenue and Expenditure Account—					
12,17,216.52	Surplus as on	Rs.	P.		
	31-3-66	12,17,216.52			
	Deficit during				
	the year	1,22,287.52			
77,12,743.68				10,94,929.00	76,35,176.36
Dr. Wali Mohd. Waqf Alal Aulad					
1,00,000.00	Capital .			1,00,000.00	
3,141.43	Miscellaneous Receipts .			10,470.60	
1,03,141.43					1,10,470.60
Overdrafts with Bank—					
23,98,372.98	General Fund .			21,42,790.00	
4,99,893.79	Development Grant Account .			1,09,166.66	
3,59,215.32	Medical College Fund .			5,27,251.54	
32,57,482.09					27,79,208.20
6,70,32,050.75	Total				7,54,94,088.06

J.P. GOEL,
Assistant Account Officer

* The corresponding figure appearing under "Inter-Fund Advances at page 5839 is Rs. 2,67,063.52. The discrepancy of Rs. 25,000 has been set right in 1967-68 Accounts.

Assets	As on 31-3-67				As on 31-3-66	
	Amount		Amount			
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.

Total	7,54,94,088.06	6,70,32,050.75
-----------------	----------------	----------------

LACHMAN DAS,
Accounts Officer

M. L. SOBTI,
Treasurer

AUDIT CERTIFICATE

I have examined the foregoing accounts and the Balance Sheet of the Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, and obtained all the information and explanations that I have required and, subject to the observations in the separate audit report, I certify, as a result of my audit, that in my opinion these Accounts and the Balance Sheet are properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, according to the best of my information and explanations given to me and as shown by the books of the Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.

Allahabad :
The 17th June, 1968

H. B. BHAR,
Accountant General, Uttar Pradesh

New Delhi :
The 26th June, 1968

Countersigned
S. RANGANATHAN,
Comptroller and Auditor General of India

BANK RECONCILIATION STATEMENT AS ON 31st MARCH, 1967

	General Fund		Development Grant Account		Deposit Account		Medical College Fund		Fund Provident	
	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Balance as per Accounts	—21,42,790.00		—1,09,166.66		+4,25,378.24		—5,27,251.54		+7,48,611.79	
<i>Deduct—</i>										
Remittances in transit	—2,49,199.94		—3,94,319.37		—1,76,698.46		—200.00		—6,90,789.08	
Erroneous/Un-classified debits by the Bank	—79,221.79		—11,659.33			+715.95	
	—24,71,211.73		—5,15,145.36		+2,48,679.78		—5,27,451.54		58,528.73	
<i>Add—</i>										
Uncashed Cheques	+19,15,412.03		+7,18,442.27		+76,796.05		+1,644.71		+12,748.05	
Erroneous/Un-classified credits by the Bank	+53,728.64		+22,045.00		+147.00		
Balance as per Bank Statement	—5,02,071.06		+2,25,341.91		+3,25,622.83		—5,25,806.83		+71,277.42	

ANNEXURE TO THE
STATEMENT SHOWING THE DETAILS

S.No.	Name of Fund	Investments Including Fixed Deposits		Lands and Buildings		Books		Equipment	
		Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
1.	Permanent Endowment .	30,00,000.00
2.	Permanent Reserve Fund	18,86,122.13	..	1,11,937.06
3.	Special Floating Reserve Fund .	4,21,498.21	..	4,71,536.99
4.	Floating Reserve Fund	2,13,480.28
5.	Trust Fund .	4,05,646.67	..	76,945.52
6.	Depreciation Fund .	10,67,952.33
7.	Building Fund	1,22,01,139.10
8.	College of Engineering & Technology Fund .	2,49,375.00	..	9,42,587.50
9.	Current Expenses Fund .	95,849.02	..	20,871.87
Total—General Fund .		71,26,443.36	..	1,40,38,498.32
10.	Development Grant Account	1,88,82,376.11	..	20,38,714.88	..	88,02,010.75	..
11.	Deposit Account .	5,84,991.14	..	17,79,152.57
12.	Provident Fund .	51,34,061.63
13.	Medical College Fund .	7,63,751.31	..	73,78,676.59
14.	Dr. Wali Mohd. Waqf. Alal Aulad .	1,00,000.00
Grand Total .		1,37,09,247.44	..	4,20,78,703.59	..	20,38,714.88	..	88,02,010.75	..

BALANCE SHEET

OF VARIOUS FUNDS AS AT 31st MARCH, 1967

Furniture		Loans & Advances		Inter-Fund Advances		Miscellaneous Debit Balances		Cash Balance		Total	
Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
..			30,00,000.00	
..			1,940.81		20,00,000.00	
..		8,000.00			37,322.78		9,38,357.98	
..			1,47,649.51		3,61,129.79	
..			79,653.65		5,62,245.84	
..			2,68,232.44		13,36,184.77	
..			5,469.56		1,22,06,608.66	
..		497.45		..		(a)		—21,212.91		11,71,247.04	
..		79.09		5,94,040.59		32,68,179.83		—26,61.11	14.81	13,17,905.59	
..		8,576.54		5,94,040.59		32,68,179.83		(b)			
..			—21,42,058.97		2,28.93,679.67	
13,32,604.36			7,97,299.07		—1,09,166.66		3,17,93.838.51	
..		6,699.40		6,76,004.39		2,02,851.11		4,25,378.24		36.75	076.85
..		2,85,974.45		4,38,000.00		..		7,48,601.79		66,06,637.87	
..		..		20,000.00		..		—5,27,251.54		76,35,176.36	
..			10,470.60		1,10,470.60	
13,82,604.36		3,01,250.39		17,28,044.98		42,68,330.01		—15,94,016.54		7,27,14,879.86	

(a) Includes Rs. 28,942.12 on account of Permanent Advances.

(b) Includes Rs. 731.03 lying with the State Bank of India, Karachi.

[No. F 1 (3)/68 (Accts.)]

J. R. PARSICHA, Treasurer.

